THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the good old days of German theology it was common enough for two savants to hold an *Auseinandersetzung* in the columns of some periodical. (One thinks of Bousset *v.* Wernle or Barth *v.* Brunner.) The German word is hardly translatable into English, but the idea is clear enough. It is a theological 'dust-up' with the gloves off. Provided the contestants keep their tempers and refrain from *odium theologicum*, the spectacle is exhilarating, and the disputation helps to clarify the issues and to promote the cause of truth.

It would appear to be the policy of the new *Scottish Journal of Theology* to foster this frank and fearless exchange of theological blows; and in the last two numbers of the magazine we have an excellent example, the whole thing being conducted on the highest level. The subject is Universalism — the doctrine that all souls will ultimately be saved—which Brunner has recently pronounced 'a menacing heresy.'

In Volume II No. 2, Dr. Robinson of Wells, posing the question, 'Is Universalism heretical?,' advances a notable defence of the alleged 'heresy.' In the current number, however, Dr. T. F. Torrance of Aberdeen takes up the gage and puts a lance in rest for orthodoxy.

The problem of Universalism, says Dr. Robinson, is really that of reconciling the omnipotent love of God with human freedom. The dilemma is this. *Either* the Divine love is omnipotent and *must* conquer, thus impairing the reality of freedom; *or* human freedom is inviolable, in which case there can be no necessity in the Divine victory. So we must show either that the loss of some souls is compatible with Divine omnipotence, or that the saving of all souls does not infringe human freedom.

St. Thomas Aquinas, representing orthodoxy, maintains the first of these two theses. He distinguishes between the absolute will of God and the consequent will of God. God absolutely wills that all men shall be saved, just as a just judge desires that all men shall live. But just as a just judge must will that a murderer be hanged, so it is God's consequent will that some men should be damned, if His justice is to be preserved.

Dr. Robinson rejects this Thomist solution. It cannot preserve the identity of the Divine love and the Divine justice, he says, and proceeds to defend the second thesis. It is wrong to think of Divine omnipotence and human freedom as two irresistible forces pulling in opposite directions. When (to take a human example) a man shows his love to us in some costing way, though we are free to respond to it quite differently, we surrender to that love, and in surrendering feel that we were never more ourselves. May we not imagine a love so strong that ultimately no one will be able to restrain himself from free surrender to it? But (you may object) does not an omnipotent love which knows from the beginning that it must conquer cut the nerve of human freedom? In reply Dr. Robinson returns to his human analogy. From it he advances to the concept of the ultimately unendurable love of God which must bring the sinner to his knees in surrender. But is this human analogy valid? Yes, because, as Buber says, reality is only found in the I-thou relationship of meeting. Human logic may not be able to resolve the dilemma, but a theology of personal realities can turn the 'either-or' into a 'both-and.' For to the subject in gracious relations with God there is no felt contradiction between what he does and God does in him.

At this point Dr. Torrance enters the lists. He accuses Dr. Robinson of illegitimately calling in Buber to save him from a logical impasse. But the gravamen of his charge is in this sentence: 'Is the love of God to be understood abstractly in terms of what we can think about it on a human analogy, or are we to understand the love of God in terms of what God has actually manifested of His love, that is Biblically?' Dr. Robinson,

moreover, has not reckoned sufficiently with the irrationality, the surd-like character, of sin. Nor is his human analogy convincing, except aesthetically. An analogy much more to the point could be found in the Bible, in the relationship between Jesus and Judas. Dr. Torrance asks: If Dr. ROBINSON's argument is sound, why did not Judas who for some years enjoyed the love of the Son of God find it irresistible? Further, is not the Cross God's way of dealing with the chasm created by man's sin? We must not go behind Calvary to argue our way by logic to a conclusion which makes the Cross meaningless.

Shall we be universalists or not? Many of our most eminent modern theologians are universalists, and we dare not lightly dismiss a doctrine that claims among its supporters William Temple, John Baillie, C. H. Dodd and Charles Raven. Moreover, if we hold, as most Christians do, that the Cross was a sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, we must admit that universal salvation is a real possibility. Yet does not dogmatic Universalism lay itself open to the double charge of being both unethical and unscriptural? If all men must willy nilly be saved in the end of the day, is not the way open for some to say: 'Let us sin and do devilries *ad lib.*, for God's a good fellow and will damn none.' Moreover, quote texts from St. Paul as we may, we cannot honestly deny that the prevailing tone of the New Testament is against Universalism. When Christ Himself was asked, 'Are there few that be saved?,' He did not return a direct answer, but He did say that the gate was narrow, that it was not the many who were finding it, and that to postpone the effort to enter it might be fatal. And even in so universalist-sounding a text as Jn 3^{16} the possibility of 'perishing' is clearly envisaged. So, in the end, will not most of us agree with Denney: 'There is such a thing as being excluded from fellowship with God and with good spirits; there is such a thing as final exclusion. It is not for us to say on whom this awful sentence falls, or whether they are many or few; we can trust the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ that it will not fall on any who do not freely and deliberately pronounce it themselves.'

In the philosophic field covered by Mr. E. L. MASCALL's book, *Existence and Analogy*,[1] dedicated with what must be some assumption of special appropriateness or relevancy to the 'Queen of Heaven and Bringer-forth of God,' far more extensive contributions have been made by Roman Catholic writers than by Protestant theologians. The explanation may be partly that in a Church operating with dogma in the Roman way it matters little if speculation, the results of which, if any, can be grasped, or grasped at, only by experts, is carried on over the heads of common folk; for the experts have the stimulus of the reflection that if their conclusions receive official imprimatur they may mould or enlarge the infallible doctrine to be received as authoritative. Protestant theologians are hampered for flight in regions of abstract speculation by the conviction that what is important in religion must be capable of appreciation by the plain man.

[1] Longmans; 12s. 6d. net.

One feature of to-day, however, is the effort to revive general interest in speculative theology. This author, in his profound and learned discussion, expresses his enthusiasm for Natural Theology and his conviction that a modernized Thomism can furnish a philosophy consonant both with the Hebrew belief in the Living God and with the modern conception of reality as action rather than substance. He holds that it is fundamental in Christian metaphysics to give primacy to the fact of existence rather than to the notion of essence, and extols the merit of St. Thomas's existentialism in beginning from facts like motion or dependence or contingency that are inherent in finite existence rather than from some idea in his own mind of the essence of God.

Rejecting the ontological proof of the existence of God he defends the cosmological approach in the sense that not by argument but by contemplation of facts the existence of God may be put beyond doubt. This contemplation may be just the simple man's wonder at the external world; or it may be the philosophical conclusion emerging from the study of the famous Five Ways of Aquinas, that the very existence of finite, contingent and imperfect beings demonstrates the existence of a self-existent, self-sufficient Being who has brought them into existence by an unconditioned act of sheer will.

This result may seem too bare to have religious value. But its critical importance is that the establishment of existence opens the way to the argument from analogy, analogy requiring the actual existence of the things between which analogy is found. In this way the concept of God receives enrichment of all kinds, the qualities discerned in finite creatures being by analogy rightly regarded as manifestations of the Divine nature.

Now it might perhaps be a splendid thing to prove by sheer unchallengeable logic that God in

the noblest soaring sense of that word is no figment of fancy but is really there. The obvious logical difficulty is whether the statement 'God exists' can be made without first having a concept of God. And it may well seem that such a concept could only be a gift of God Himself, and that therefore the question of His existence is settled before it can be raised.

It has been thought to avoid the difficulty by substituting for the proposition, 'God exists,' the words 'I affirm God.' If this is more than a verbal trick it is an assertion of an awareness of God coming not by any process of reason known to Natural Theology, but in a way for which a new word, revelation, is necessary.

It seems thus to become clear, against the author's contention, that revelation cannot be considered an addition or supplement to what unaided human faculties might discover. It is needed before any beginning of reflection about God can be made. God Himself is the instigator of all, even the most rudimentary thought about Him. The distinction between Natural and Revealed Religion is philosophically untenable. The battle sometimes staged between Natural and other Theology is 'sound and fury.'

Comparatively few will find their faith enlarged by the pursuit of such studies. Yet any hasty inclination to cynicism must be halted by the reflection that so many pious and erudite and influential men in all ages have found the exercise congenial and believed it relevant to the life of faith and duty and a factor in the course of history.

It is with pleasure that we note one point at which Mr. MASCALL's words catch fire; namely where he deprecates the modern tendency to throw aside the doctrine of the impassibility of God as incompatible with His loving compassion. He finely argues that the doctrine is entirely defensible on the ground that from God, as even from human friends, we look not merely for sympathy but for help, and that, therefore, we need a God who is above the battle in the sense that in Him compassion and impassibility are taken up into a union of omnipotence and love, and that only with such a God can the ultimate perfect fellowship be a joy.

Literature.

CLAIMS OF THE FREE CHURCHES.

THE Principal of the Baptist College in Manchester, the Rev. Henry Townsend, M.A., D.D., has chosen a challenging but not inappropriate title for his new book — *The Claims of the Free Churches* (Hodder and Stoughton; 15s. net)—and, remembering especially a recent book with a similar but 'opposite number' designation, is perhaps a little over-conscious of those who might wish to dispute his claims before they have been sternly admonished into good behaviour. But one is impressed by the comprehensiveness of his treatment and the value of the positive contribution he makes to the history of the Free Churches, as he traces the development of their principles and their growing influence upon the religious, political, and social structures of the English people. His aim is not to reopen old sores but to ensure that those who appreciate — or depreciate — a certain body of tradition, should do what they do with understanding.

The general nature of the controversy is indicated in the opening chapter on the conception of the Church, and the author concentrates very markedly on the opposition of the Free Churches to Episcopacy and Establishment. He thinks that John Morley was right when he said that 'there is not a single crisis in the growth of English liberties in which the State Church has not been the champion of retrogression and obstruction.' The statistics given are certainly not favourable to the Anglican record, but we think that in fairness more importance might have been assigned to the exceptions which our author mentions. There were prominent Anglicans who were sympathetic toward the grievances of the Chartists and active in the Abolitionist struggle. Also, if the author had been more fully aware of the existence of Scotland, he might have discovered that it is possible to have an establishment which is not Episcopal and a State Church which is at the same time Free.

Undoubtedly, however, it is a sorry tale he has to tell of the oppression of the Free Churches in England, and one becomes almost conscience-stricken at our easy forgetfulness of the relentlessness of persecution and the dilatoriness of the removal of injustices.

Dr. Townsend is at his best in his estimate of

the contribution of the Free Churches to the spread of education and to the development of a healthy spirit of democracy; and in an exceedingly able chapter on 'Activism and Economics' he rebuts the charge that the Reformation was to blame for some of the worst evils of Capitalism, and shows conclusively that the sense of 'calling' had wide reference to the ultimate end of life and work and not merely to diligence—and success—in business. His account of the expansion of Free Church principles to America and the Commonwealth and their share in missionary activity makes inspiring reading, although he is rather rueful over the fact that American visitors to this country are more interested in the old Cathedrals than in the unadorned meeting-houses sacred in Nonconformist memories.

In 1939 a German religious leader said sadly: 'If we had only had in Germany the kind of Free Church Movement you have had in England, our history would have been different.' Dr. Townsend has done much to show how relevant this comment was, and how great is the indebtedness of the whole community to those who established its relevance. W. S. URQUHART.

CALVIN'S DOCTRINE OF MAN.

The recent revival of interest in the Reformers has not produced much literature in English on Calvin, but an important contribution is now made in *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, by the Rev. T. F. Torrance, M.B.E., B.D., D.Theol. (Lutterworth Press; 14s. net). Of the twelve chapters perhaps the most important are four on the Image of God (interesting for its bearing on the controversy between Barth and Brunner), and two each on Total Perversity and on Natural Theology. The author owes to his sermon preparation as thorough a knowledge of Calvin's numerous works as he previously displayed of the Apostolic Fathers. Convinced that Calvin's own position was very different from traditional Calvinism, he has altogether avoided all commentators on Calvin. Thus the book consists largely of citations from Calvin, with as little interpretation as possible, and therefore, despite some excellent summaries, makes rather austere reading. The author fears he may have been too kind to Calvin, and admits that he has assumed that Calvin could not have been as self-contradictory as he would at first appear.

Dr. Torrance makes good his claim that Calvin's distinctions have been made too rigid by his interpreters, and that there are a range and profundity in his thought which have not always been recognized. Calvin himself, he admits, was sometimes too rigid, particularly in regard to predestination and providence. Several defenders of Calvin have said that the notorious doctrine of predestination is but a detail in Calvin's theology; Dr. Torrance dismisses it in a footnote (p. 141, n. 7): 'Calvin insists that the doctrine of transubstantiation is a denial of analogy, and makes an absurdity of any real knowledge in the sacrament. It is a form of the docetic heresy. The same criticism applies to Calvin's form of the doctrine of predestination.' Comments as interesting as this make us wish for a fuller interpretation and defence of Calvin. The author claims that the modern theologian can find no better solution to modern problems than he will reach through a careful study of Calvin's thoroughly Biblical position, but explicitly declines to point out any of these solutions here. No doubt there is much that is valuable in Calvin in so far as there is much that is Christian, but what is the value of his distinctive emphasis, translated into modern categories? Dr. Torrance has helped us to see Calvin more clearly: he would put us further in his debt if he would now himself show Calvin's relevance to modern problems.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE.

DANIEL LINDLEY.

If the usual sepulchral voice were to announce 'And the next object is Daniel Lindley,' probably even the adroit persons who figure in the B.B.C.'s 'Twenty Questions' would be flummoxed. For few of us have ever heard of that worthy man. Yet he has cut his name into South African history. A town there is called after him. And there are other tokens that he has a sure place in the affections of the Boers, partly through his character, but not a little because of his unusual prowess as a swimmer, as a shot, and as a horseman, all three achievements dear to the Boer mind, and ranking with them very high indeed. It is not our fault that we are ignorant of Lindley. For, though he has been dead for seventy years, it is only now that the first book about him has been issued—*The Life and Times of Daniel Lindley (1801–80)*, by Mr. Edwin W. Smith (Epworth Press; 21s. net). The times rather smother the man. And hectic times they were. The story opens in America, with tales of uneasy days of peril. Lindley's father was born in a fort, into which the white settlers had crowded in expectation of a Red Indian raid. And when, after a successful ministry in his own land, Lindley went to South Africa as a missionary he found himself caught up in the wars and rumours of war, in the whole ferocious story of the contendings of Matabele, and Zulus, and Boers, and so on—a grim and horrid tale, set down here with such detail

that the main figure of the book often disappears for many pages on end, or comes to the surface only momentarily now and then.

A first attempt to found a mission station failed. Thereafter Lindley was, for some eight years, the minister of the Boers in their great trek, since, for one reason and another, none of their own ministry would accompany them. He had an enormous parish; at first all Natal, all the Free State, and all the Transvaal, as they later came to be called. He baptized nearly seven thousand children—on one Sunday alone a hundred and eighty-seven; and he travelled to and fro, visiting and preaching to his scattered flock of twenty thousand souls. With characteristic modesty he says simply, 'These were, I think, years of usefulness.' I think so too! Among those whom he admitted to the full membership of the Church were a boy of eighteen called Paul Kruger and a lad named Joubert, both of whom were to play a big part in their land and day. Later Lindley returned to mission work. He had toiled to secure justice for the natives in the matter of land and other things. And he settled in one of the reservations which were allotted to them. It is difficult to assess the results of his mission work. The actual figures make no great showing. But Lindley was reticent and even shy about his own work. He never boasted. He undoubtedly won affection from Boer and Briton, from black man and white man, and that without trying. There is not, perhaps, sufficient material to form a correct judgment. But this reticent, manly, humorous, big-hearted human being, photographed for us here, wins and holds the heart.

A. J. Gossip.

THE JUDICIOUS HOOKER.

The Rev. F. J. Shirley, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A., Canon Residentiary of Canterbury and Headmaster of the King's School, experienced great inconvenience and vexatious delays in getting his book, *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas* (S.P.C.K.; 14s. 6d. net), before the public. The War 'exiled' him to Cornwall where library facilities were few. Yet it is in no way obvious that the book has suffered. Clearly and pithily written, it is a work of first-rate scholarship.

Hooker's greatness rests on his one notable production—'The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.' That aimed at and succeeded in vindicating the Church of England. We may agree with Dr. Shirley's view that Hooker is 'the greatest apologist that the Church of England has ever enjoyed,' making only this reservation that the Church of England to-day is not quite the Church Hooker had in view, so that some positions for which Hooker contended are almost the opposite of what a modern Anglican would maintain. But in his own age, with its seething mass of criticism of the Church, Hooker undoubtedly deserves Dr. Shirley's eulogy.

The 'enemy' Hooker confronted was not Rome but Geneva. He is perfectly definite in his rejection of Romanism when he has occasion to refer to it, but the occasions are few. That controversy was settled. The sharpest attack on the Church in his day was being launched and maintained by other rebels from Rome who had won a complete victory in Scotland, and for a time seemed likely to sweep away in England all that meant the Church of England to Hooker.

Against them Hooker brought to bear vast erudition and could lash them never with invective, but with a keen wit. Some of his arguments, all may now acknowledge, are unanswerable. We should agree with him for instance that not everything in the constitution or government of the Church is, as some in his day held, clearly set forth in Scripture; any more than many details of a Christian's everyday behaviour. In addition to Scripture, Hooker gave a place to 'reason' as source of the rule of life. In his view of Church and State that they are two aspects of one and the same thing, Hooker was simply the child of his age. It was an ancient mediæval view which few of the first generations of Protestants thought of abandoning.

Dr. Shirley's estimate of the influence of Hooker is sober and balanced.

He enters more insecure ground—as he frankly confesses—when he attempts to set forth what Hooker's views might be on present-day attempts at the reunion of Christendom. This is not Hooker's age and he would probably find himself at a loss to deal with it. It is useless to guess what Gladstone or Hooker would say in 1949.

W. D. Niven.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Since he retired from his University Chair, Professor Theodore H. Robinson has actively interested himself in Bible teaching in schools. The Middlesex County Council Agreed Syllabus owes not a little to his inspiration and enthusiasm. He is deeply concerned about the future of religion and feels that the solution to the problem lies in better Bible teaching to adolescents. Now, at the request of the Education Officer for the Borough of Ealing, he has written *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Edward Arnold; 3s. net). The book is a marvel of cheapness, for it contains close on two hundred pages and has no fewer than

thirty-six maps and illustrations. The word 'Introduction' in the title covers more than is usually meant by the word in its technical sense, as of the discipline that deals with the dates and authorship of the books in the Bible. Of the thirteen chapters of the book three deal with the History, and three with the Religion of Israel. The whole is thus a comprehensive introduction to the Old Testament.

Dr. Robinson in his Preface confesses to 'grave doubts as to whether the attempt has been a success.' But he is, quite rightly, 'assured by competent authority that it may well prove interesting to all teachers of Scripture and possibly also to certain types of scholar.' It is, indeed, a book that should meet a real need. Here is the expert, writing clearly and with many an apt and telling illustration, bringing scholarship to the understanding of the Upper Fifth. Several pages of Questions and Subjects for Discussion should commend it also to study groups in the churches. There are even a four-page Table of Dates and an adequate Index. C. R. NORTH.

A dozen years ago Dr. Elmer T. Clark produced a fascinating book on *The Small Sects in America*. He has continued his investigations in the interval, and the work now appears in a new and enlarged edition (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $3.00). The book will be to many a somewhat startling revelation of the curious extremes to which individualistic interpretation of Holy Scripture may run. For all these small eccentric sects think that they—and often they alone—are doing justice to Scripture. The author has taken enormous pains to ascertain the facts; and classifies the various bodies into groups according to their affinities. It is at many points of interest to us on this side, because a number of those American-born sects have in recent years spread into our own country.

The Preacher's Handbook, edited by the Rev. Greville P. Lewis, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is the first volume of what is intended to be a series, and is hoped to be of real assistance to 'local preachers.' For the most part these worthy men are engaged in business which takes up an increasing part of their time, and they have little leisure for study. This Handbook will be a great reinforcement to them in their voluntary duty as licensed preachers. The first volume contains general articles on such topics as The Conduct of Public Prayer, The Christian Year, The Gospel Message; also a section on the great truths declared in the various religious festivals; and, finally, two articles on 'The Christian Doctrine of Man' and 'The Life of Jesus.' There can be little doubt that this series of books will greatly encourage, enlighten, and strengthen those to whom it is addressed.

Messrs. Ginn and Company are publishing a series of educational books for Grammar Schools. The books are planned to meet the needs of classes from the bottom (age 11–12) to the top (age 17–18) in the school. They are carefully graded. The books are illustrated and equipped with maps. A reference book is published with each text book in which teaching hints, exercises, factual notes, extracts from authorities and general reference material are given. These books are primarily for the use of teachers, but in the higher forms pupils will be able to use the reference books for the solution of their own problems. The series is published as an aid to the teaching of Scripture. The approach is historical; the end is religious. Classes who follow the scheme will 'know their Bible' and understand its real character and claims.

The title of the series is *The Bible and the Christian Faith*. There are six books, with corresponding reference books. Book one is 'Christ in the Gospels,' book two, 'Christ in the Early Church,' book three, 'A People of Hope,' book four (just published), *Poets, Wise Men, and Seers*, book five, 'Christ in Conduct,' and book six (also just published), *From Bible to Creed*. Scholars as distinguished as the late Dr. J. K. Mozley and Dr. T. H. Robinson are among the contributors. The prices range from five to six shillings, and similar prices apply to the reference books. Very complete descriptive material will be supplied to any interested. It will be seen that a complete course of religious education for the upper forms is to be found here. The ground has been thoroughly covered, and the books are attractively produced and clearly printed. We draw the attention of those interested in religious education to this remarkable series of books which will appeal both to teachers and pupils and will meet the requirements of both.

An excellent book on Early Church History written on the Mission Field in Nyasaland by the Rev. A. Bevil Browne, and entitled *The Way and the Faith*, was published by Messrs. Macmillan in 1936. It is now re-issued by Messrs. Mowbray and Co. (7s. 6d. net). The format is new; otherwise the book is an exact page-by-page, and word-for-word reproduction. It is 'popular' yet scholarly. In sixty short chapters it handles a great many topics in most interesting fashion. We hope it will be widely read by the lay public; and we commend it to students beginning the study of early ecclesiastical history.

Gog and Magog in the Twentieth Century.

By Professor Emeritus J. Hugh Michael, M.A., D.D., Emmanuel College, Toronto.

The brief paragraph in the Book of Revelation which tells of the mobilization of Gog and Magog against the Beloved City (20^{7-10}) possesses a peculiar relevance to the time in which we live. It occurs in a section of the Apocalypse in which use is made by the writer of a conventional scheme of the last things which meets us with varying details in many Jewish writings.

Here only is mention made of Gog and Magog in the New Testament. It is not part of our present concern to consider the origin of the names, or to trace their various occurrences in Jewish and other literatures. As he wrote, John almost certainly had in his mind chs. 38 and 39 of Ezekiel, for his paragraph has a decided affinity with these two chapters. Ezekiel (38^{2}) speaks of 'Gog, of the land of Magog,' a phrase in which Magog is generally understood to be the name of the land from which Gog comes; but it is by no means impossible that in Ezekiel, as with John, Magog is the name, not of a land, but of a people. In the Apocalypse both Gog and Magog are clearly names of peoples.

In Ezekiel Gog is the ruler of vague northern hordes who are led by him in an assault upon the restored Israel and the city of Jerusalem. The character and the equipment of his enormous force are set forth in words addressed to him by the Eternal God: 'I will bring you along, with all your army, horses and horsemen, in full armour, a mighty host all armed with shields and targes and all wielding swords, warriors from Persia, Kush, and Put, equipped with targes and helmets, all the hordes of the Cimmerians, all the hordes from Armenia in the far north, and many another nation in your train' (38^{4-6} [Moffatt]).

There is a notable parallelism between the assault upon Israel and Jerusalem in Ezekiel and the onset upon the Camp of the Saints and the Beloved City in John's passage.

Look first at Ezekiel. Ch. 37, in which comes the well-known Vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, contains also the description of the glorious new kingdom—a single nation no longer divided—which the Eternal God will establish 'upon the uplands of Israel.' The closing words of the chapter, as rendered by Dr. Moffatt, run thus: 'my dwelling-place shall be with them, I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and when my sanctuary remains among them for ever, the nations shall learn that I am the Eternal who sets Israel apart.'

This Divine declaration might well have formed the climax of the prophecies of Ezekiel, or at all events we should have expected ch. 37 to be followed immediately by chs. 40–48 which describe the organization of the restored community. But no: there intervenes, in chs. 38 and 39, the assault of Gog and his hordes upon Jerusalem and the new Israel. 'The vast and mysterious forces of the world's barbarism must be destroyed,' as Dr. Lofthouse observes, 'before Israel's peace is unshakable' (*Ezekiel*, in 'The Century Bible,' 275).

Now look at John's narrative. He has already described in chs. 17–19 the destruction of the City of Rome, of the Empire and its allies, and of the Priesthood of the Imperial Cult. Then an angel, we are told, cast the Devil 'into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him' (20^{3}). That, one would think, must be the end of the Devil's activity. And as his imprisonment is followed by the millennial reign of the martyrs with Christ, it is natural to expect that, when the thousand years are finished, the time has arrived for the descent of the New Jerusalem out of heaven from God. But no: many things happen before that comes to pass. What these things are is recorded in 20^{7-10}. Satan is loosed out of his prison; he deceives the nations Gog and Magog, and gathers them together for war; the host encircles the Camp of the Saints and the Beloved City, but is devoured by fire from heaven; then, finally, the Devil is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.

Rome and the Empire have indeed been destroyed, but that does not mean that all the evil in the world has been exterminated. John must take cognizance of the unknown and mysterious peoples dwelling beyond the confines of the Empire, ready to fall a prey to any evil influence that might be brought to bear upon them. Here was a repository of evil that might pit itself against the holy will of God. Before the New Jerusalem could be established that evil had to be annihilated. That is why John introduces the episode of Gog and Magog and records their destruction by fire from heaven.

At many epochs in the strange story of our race the parable of Gog and Magog has been applicable. We think of onsets and assaults made by Scythians, Goths, Huns, and Vandals. Is it not peculiarly

applicable at this very moment? John's paragraph might have been written with a view to our day. It tells of three things: (*a*) a world-wide dementation; (*b*) a deceiving inspiration; and (*c*) a complete obliteration.

(*a*) It is a world-wide movement that is pictured by John, an onset by vast hordes. He speaks of Gog and Magog as 'the nations which are in the four corners of the earth'; the number of them is 'as the sand of the sea.' We are told that 'they went up over the breadth of the earth,' or, as Moffatt renders, that 'they swarmed over the broad earth.' The huge number of the attacking force is also a feature of Ezekiel's narrative. 'Thou shalt ascend,' says the Eternal God to Gog, 'thou shalt come like a storm, thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou, and all thy hordes, and many peoples with thee' (38[9]).

Each of the two prophets contemplates a world-wide dementation when men in vast numbers would be possessed by an evil spirit hostile to all that is precious in the sight of God. 'The movement which St. John foresees,' writes Swete, 'is not dictated by an imperial policy, but is the result of a common impulse which will seize men of all races and nationalities.' An easy prey the Beloved City would appear in the eyes of the attacking host. Indeed, in Ezekiel, God Almighty informs the prophet that Gog is forming an evil design and saying to himself: 'I will invade this land of villages, I will attack this quiet folk who are all living in security, with never a wall or a bar or a gate' (38[11] [Moffatt]).

The Beloved City stands for the things of God. Should we greatly err if we thought of her as representing the Church of God, the society of the redeemed? With all her faults and failings the Church is the truest embodiment of the things that are precious in God's sight. Was there ever a time when the Church faced so much subtle opposition as she is facing to-day? Not to speak of the neglect and disregard of the Church prevalent in many lands, vast masses of people in different countries are intoxicated with a ruthless, immoral ideology which is the very negation of the things for which the Church stands. 'Communism,' to quote Barth, 'is a religion the like of which has perhaps not been seen in opposition to Christianity since the days of early Islam.' Speaking of Communism and Christianity, Lenin is reported to have said that 'for either to win, the other must be completely destroyed.' And Brunner in an address delivered before the recent Assembly of the Congregational Union spoke of Communism as 'this truly devilish system of inhumanity.' These are sayings to ponder seriously. Many of those who succumb to Communism do so, no doubt, under compulsion, but when full allowance has been made for this consideration, we are faced with the alarming truth that whole nations or large sections of nations are willingly adopting a fanatical creed which is fiercely hostile to the Christian Faith, persecutes the Christian Church, and robs its own adherents of their freedom. The spirit of Gog and Magog was signally revealed in the treatment of Church leaders in Eastern European countries. Gog and Magog are indeed swarming over the broad earth against the Beloved City. In a paper of recent date an 'official' is reported to have stated that 'the British Government sees the Far East crisis in terms of a Communist tide which might sweep over a region inhabited by a billion people.'

(*b*) The hordes which encompass the Beloved City are, according to John, deceived by Satan (*v.* 8). Ezekiel, in keeping with the Hebrew conception of God as the ultimate source and cause of all things, speaks of Him as bringing Gog and his hosts against the restored community of Israel. 'Be ready,' says the Almighty to Gog, 'hold yourself ready, you and all your muster, hold yourself in reserve for me! . . . I will bring you against my land, to let the nations learn what I am, when I show them my dread divinity in handling you' (38[7. 16] [Moffatt]). At the same time Ezekiel recognizes that Gog is impelled by an evil design that forms itself in his own mind: 'Thus saith the Lord God: It shall come to pass in that day, that things shall come into thy mind, and thou shalt devise an evil device' (38[10]). In John's thought, we may suppose, the release of Satan is brought about by God, and to that extent his view accords with that of Ezekiel which regards Jehovah as bringing Gog 'from the far north to attack the uplands of Israel' (39[2] [Moffatt]).

Deceived by Satan? Is there really any room for Satan in modern thought? In recent decades it has often been easy to sympathize with John's belief in the existence of a personal Satan. We have been startled and saddened by atrocities so unhuman that it did not seem possible to find their origin in the spontaneous workings of the mind of man. Instinctively we spoke of them as diabolical. Can we be sure that the persons who committed such atrocities were not the instruments of some evil power outside themselves? And does not the spirit that has taken possession of nations and peoples to-day beget surmisings of this kind in our minds? We marvel as we behold millions of people held in the grip of a strange and perilous ideology. Whether with John we accept the theory of deception by a personal Satan, or whether we prefer to seek in the language

of psychology for some phrase to describe the evil spirit that is leading men astray, there can be no manner of doubt that such a spirit is at work. It is most active in the lying propaganda so prevalent in the world.

The conception of the imprisonment and the subsequent release of Satan is, as Dr. Moffatt says, 'an obscure and curious feature, borrowed in part from earlier beliefs in Judaism, but directly or indirectly from a legend common to Persian and Hellenic eschatology.' The strange notion provides a kind of parable of what has happened in our generation. At the turn of the century, when things seemed prosperous in Church and State and the prospect for the future appeared so bright, men might have been forgiven for thinking that the spirit of evil had been cast into prison. But no such illusion is possible now, after all the devastation wrought in recent years and in view of all the evil, suffering, and confusion existing in the world to-day. Truly a Satanic spirit is abroad in the earth, and it is a spirit of deception.

(*c*) We have quoted Lenin to the effect that for Communism or Christianity to win, the other must be completely destroyed. Are we sometimes tempted to wonder which of the two will gain the upper hand? We know what John would say if he were here. There was in his mind no shadow of doubt that the evil represented by Gog and Magog would be completely and utterly obliterated.

Nor was there in the mind of Ezekiel any doubt as to the utter annihilation of Gog and his mighty host. The Eternal God declares: 'I will punish him with pestilence and bloodshed, I will rain on him and his hordes and all the nations in his train an overpowering flood, with hailstones, fire, and brimstone' (38^{22} [Moffatt]); and to Gog himself He sends this message: 'On the uplands of Israel you shall fall, you and all your hordes and allies; I will leave you as food for all sorts of ravenous birds and wild beasts to devour' (39^{4} [Moffatt]). In a vivid passage we are told that the weapons of the slain hordes would supply Israel with firewood for seven years! It would take the whole population seven months to bury the dead, and they would be buried, not within the Holy Land, but in a place beyond its confines, east of the Dead Sea. At the end of the seven months men were to be selected to search for any corpses that might remain; and when in the course of their search a human bone was sighted a mark was put up beside it so that no single bone might be missed.

In John's narrative fire is the sole means employed for the destruction of Gog and Magog: 'and fire came down out of heaven, and devoured them.' Some ancient authorities, including the Vulgate, insert the words 'from God' in this sentence to prevent any possible uncertainty as to the source of the destroying fire.

So, though compassed about by the hordes of Gog and Magog, the Camp of the Saints and the Beloved City suffered no harm or hurt. Are 'camp' and 'city' two names for the same thing? Or is the Beloved City surrounded by an encampment of defenders? In either case the double name reminds us that the Church of God is an army as well as a city, for the word rendered 'camp' also means an army on the march or an army engaged in battle. And when we see in John's words a parable applicable to our own day how are we to interpret the devouring fire? What can we see in it but the fire of good-will and Christian charity? Love is the fire that comes from God, out of heaven. And John sees love achieving more than a temporary cessation of the activity of evil. His magnificent faith anticipates the annihilation of the spirit of evil itself. Not only are the armies of Gog and Magog consumed by fire from heaven: it is added that 'the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.' He will deceive men no more, for, unlike the abyss of *v.* 3, the lake of fire and brimstone is in our Apocalypse the place of final and irreparable doom. And surely in the last analysis this fire also must be interpreted as the fire of love. What else can overcome and destroy the evil spirit that is leading men astray? The hope of the world's salvation is in the Divine Love, which works in and through men of good-will. I do not think that this way of interpreting his words is at variance with John's own deepest thought. We need his faith and his confidence to-day. 'Beyond a doubt,' wrote Swete, 'St. John intends at least to teach that the forces, personal or impersonal, which have inspired mankind with false views of life and antagonism to God and to Christ, will in the end be completely subjugated, and, if not annihilated, will at least be prevented from causing further trouble.' But does the figure of the lake of fire permit us to think that John's faith stopped short of belief in their utter annihilation?

Doctrine of Man.

Self-deception.

By Professor the Reverend Harold Roberts, M.A., Ph.D., Richmond.

'And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him' (Gn 1^{27} R.V.).

'Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of . . . corruptible man . . . they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever' (Ro 1^{22-25} R.V.).

Man is made in the image of God. The concept of the *Imago Dei* is the key to the interpretation of human nature. It will not, however, serve as a key unless it is related to the Person and Work of Christ. Christian theology has been too prone to identify the *Imago Dei* with man's rational nature and to take over from natural theology ideas about man which may easily obscure his fundamental status. The Biblical conception of the image of God undoubtedly includes an emphasis upon man's rational faculties although the physical is not set in contrast to the psychical. It is significant that after the Exile, the term *rúach* becomes what the late Dr. Wheeler Robinson describes as a higher synonym for *néphesh* (cf. essay on 'The Pyschology of the Hebrews' in *The People and the Book*; also *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, ch. 1). *Rúach* stands pre-eminently for the relation of man to the Spirit of God. In the New Testament, πνεῦμα expresses the same idea of a special association between man and the Divine Spirit. The nature of the relationship between man and God in the Biblical record finds its most characteristic expression in the covenant relationship. Man is capable of the higher life which transcends without destroying his rational and animal nature because God has set His love upon him. The covenant relationship was revealed in its completeness in the Man Christ Jesus. Within history, the true relation between man and God was made manifest. The love of God was united to the perfect obedience of man. The New Covenant which was instituted by our Lord interprets the Old Covenant and unveils its deeper meaning. In both, the worth of man depends not upon any inherent quality he may possess or any achievement to which he may lay claim but upon the grace of God. What the grace of God means in relation to man is brought to light by all that our Lord was and did. Hence, if we are to understand the significance of the *Imago Dei*, we must go beyond the provinces of philosophy and psychology and be confronted by Him in whom the eternal nature of man is to be seen. Man has been defined in many ways—a rational animal, a cooking animal, a tool-using animal, and a laughing animal. Although each of these definitions implies that man is a creature capable of transcending the surface meaning of life and of pursuing aims and purposes which have taken shape in his mind, they overlook the most significant fact about him. He is the object of Divine love and is bound by ties which cannot be broken to Him who is the image of the Invisible God as well as the firstborn of all creation.

If man has been made in the image of God, he is nevertheless a creature. He is a finite being never to be confused with God. He shares with the whole created world certain limitations which he cannot remove. The Bible assigns to man a dignity unmatched in the world of Nature. Yet it never belittles the difference between God and man or allows man to forget that his true dignity resides in the recognition of his creaturehood. Fellowship between man and God is not possible on the basis of equality. It can only exist on the basis of worship or a recognition of man's dependence upon Divine grace. Man, however, is limited not only by the fact that he is a created being dependent for his existence upon the Divine Will. He is dependent to an important degree upon society. Whether he recognizes the fact or not, he is a social being and is conditioned if not determined by the tensions and claims of the society into which he is born. Further, his life is set in space and time. He cannot step outside the contingencies of human existence and the frustrations to which they give rise.

Man, then, is a creature who exists in a special relationship to God. Something has happened to that relationship. It has been disturbed not by the mutability of God but by the sin of man. The Bible bears unambiguous witness to the fall of man. Until recently, Gn 3 was subjected to a dogmatic strain which it could not sustain. The narrative was supposed to contain an explanation of the origin of sin and its racial consequences, even though its influence cannot be traced in the rest of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, the Bible witnesses to the fact that there is something fundamentally wrong with human nature. The conception of the Fall is, to use modern jargon,

' mythological.' It is not an attempt to give a historical or scientific account of sin and its beginnings either in the apostasy of Adam or angels. Rather it refers to the fact of apostasy which is an undeniable characteristic of human experience. Adam thus becomes not an individual whose date is a little uncertain but ourselves. What we describe as his fall is ours. We have, that is, rebelled against our true nature as creatures made in the image of God and united to God by His covenant. That revolt or rebellion is universal, and it represents a dimension of human existence whether man is considered in his individual or social relations. When, therefore, we describe man as a fallen creature, we mean that he has rebelled against God, that he has exchanged the truth of God for a lie and substituted the image of his own desires for the image of God. And, yet, he is still bound to God. He cannot destroy the Divine image or cease to be God's creature. Self-assertion which is the essence of sin bears witness to the image of God in which man is made. It is because man is able to transcend Nature and to conceive of himself over against Nature, his fellows and God, that sin becomes possible. Sin presupposes the covenant relation between man and God. The covenant is abrogated on the part of man by sin, but man is not thereby cut adrift from God. He is still in the hands of love and the Divine image is guarded by the wrath of God which is Divine love in revolt against self-assertion.

Man's rebellion against God is universal. Here we are in the presence of a problem which defies solution. The attempt to interpret sin in evolutionary terms may provide useful material for a history of sin, but it cannot account for its inevitability. Further, as Von Hügel rightly pointed out, the single source theory does not explain pride and self-love which are of the essence of sin. Sin, therefore, cannot be explained in terms of a level of existence to which it does not belong. It does not come within our purview to discuss the origin of sin. We are concerned, however, to notice that the bias toward self-assertion is universal, and given that bias which enters into every part of life—the home, education, the Church, the State —infecting even our virtues and marring the choicest gifts of God, we can at any rate see that the stage is set for the tragic history of man's disobedience.

The bias towards sin does not provide a full explanation of human sinfulness. Unless man indulged in some form of self-deception, it is difficult to see how sin could persist. Man's status is such that he is able to envisage himself as the centre of the world. He can assert his claims over against the claims of God and his fellows. On the other hand, he is reminded at every turn that he is a creature as well as a self-transcendent being. His creaturehood means that he is enmeshed in the contingencies of human life and that there are limits in the sphere of knowledge and action which he cannot remove. Frustration is an inalienable element in his experience. Hence he strives to find a way of maintaining his self-respect and of fostering the pretension that man is the measure of all things. He is committed to a policy of self-deceit which may range from intellectual and spiritual pride to neuroticism. ' The lie,' as Philip Leon has observed in *The Ethics of Power* (p. 125), ' may be directed chiefly to oneself or be meant principally for home consumption ; it is then self-deception. Or it may be intended chiefly for export ; it is then deception of others.' A closer examination would seem to suggest that even in the case of lies meant for export, the primary consideration is self-deception. We deceive others so that our own pretensions may be left unchallenged.

The concept of self-deception has loomed large in recent psychological literature. We are told that thought is used not to enable us to come to a decision but to bolster up a decision already made in response to emotional needs. The reasons we give for our actions are thus after-thoughts rather than determinants. The process of ' rationalization ' or wishful thinking is, at least, characteristic of a good deal of human behaviour. Unfortunately, the psychologists, as Niebuhr has pertinently pointed out (*The Nature and Destiny of Man*, i. 219), regard self-deception as primarily intent on social approval whereas it can only be explained in the light of man's status as a self-transcendent and yet determinate self. A similar weakness underlies the Marxian interpretation of human nature. According to the Marxist theory, our ideas are economically determined. In all human thinking there are ideological elements behind which the bias of egoistic interests find shelter. While Marxism recognizes the presence of other than economic factors, the determining factor of history is to be found in the production and reproduction of life. In spite of the fact that conscious decisions may be woven into the fabric of history they are regarded as by-products of unconscious forces. Ideology is the product of social forces and conscious reason is the tool of egoistic interests. Marxism has certainly drawn attention to the element of self-deception in human thought and conduct, in religion and morals. Ideas are socially conditioned even if they are not socially determined. Unfortunately, its conception of consciousness as a by-product of material conditions prevents it from beginning to understand the nature of man as a being who is able to stand above himself and his conditions.

It is man's egoistic bias combined with the frustration that is caused by his environment that accounts for his self-deception. If this fact had been admitted, Marxism would have discovered an ideological taint in its own ideology, and have recognized that its own philosophy was conditioned by limitations analogous to those which condition capitalist thought.

Although there is no justification, in spite of the teaching of some Schools of modern psychology and Marxism, for dethroning human reason and exalting the rôle of the unconscious, we dare not ignore the fact of self-deception to which they bear witness. It is illustrated in the growth of secular humanism or the belief that the key to social security and international peace is to be found in scientific planning. The slogan of humanism might well be 'Seek ye first the scientific attitude and all things shall be added unto you.' It is assumed that all who share this view of human redemption have been delivered from pride and prejudice, and that their motives are disinterested. To indulge in indiscriminate criticism of the various forms of humanism is a misguided exercise. In the humanist pattern of life there are elements which cannot be excluded from any Christian order of society. With much of its enterprise for human betterment as well as with its revolt against ignorance and its desire to plan national and international life on a rational basis, Christians must find themselves in full sympathy. But humanism is a way of escape and therein lies its peril. It ignores or explains away man's spiritual dimension and refuses to come to terms with his finitude. The belief that man is the measure of all things is an illusion which man cherishes as he faces the assault of a mutable and recalcitrant environment. Man is able to look beyond the immediate situation and envisage a world in which his ideals are realized. He knows, however, that the world he plans is very different from the world that comes to be. In order to preserve his pride he clings to the illusion that the frustrations of circumstances can be overcome, and that the only foe that needs to be feared is ignorance. Sin as the rebellion of being made in the image of God is explained away as the survival of a by-gone age. Humanism is thus a way of escape not only from finitude but from the fact of sin. The deep-rooted bias of man in favour of his own sovereignty yoked to a capacity for self-deception helps to account for the rallying power of humanism in the face of many shattering blows.

Self-deception is found in its most subtle and devastating form in the religious sphere, and it lies behind the tragic history of the Pharisees. Our Lord is reported as charging the Pharisees with devouring widows' houses, blocking the way to the Kingdom of God, paying homage to the prophets while ignoring their message, elevating minute trifles above duty to their fellow-men, making privilege a ground of merit rather than of responsibility. It is not surprising that Jewish and Christian scholars should have discussed the question whether, if the account of our Lord's dealings with the Pharisees is to be taken as authentic, He was justified in the strictures He passed upon them. Of course, it may be readily admitted that there were good Pharisees as well as bad, and that there were many whose fidelity to what they believed to be the will of God was beyond reproach. But when that is admitted, we have to remember, as Dr. Anderson Scott observes (*New Testament Ethics*[2], 41), that the only strictly contemporary evidence is provided by the Synoptic Gospels, and that it is exceedingly precarious in view of the wide changes that took place in Judaism after A.D. 70 to read back evidence from the close of the century into the situation of the first three decades.

The severity of our Lord's attitude as represented in the Gospels is not difficult to understand. His message struck at the root of Pharisaic legalism. The religion of the Pharisee was based upon the belief that entrance into the Kingdom of God was based upon merit whereas it was the burden of our Lord's teaching that fellowship with God rests upon Divine grace which is offered to all who will receive it in trust, gratitude, and obedience. It was inevitable that our Lord should be relentlessly opposed to any system which implied that there was room for merit in the relations between God and man, and that it was possible for us to make ourselves fit to walk with God. The charges brought against the Pharisees are to be traced to this fundamental defect which their thought and conduct represented. While a preoccupation with merit leads to despair in the case of those finer souls who refuse to bribe their conscience, more frequently it gives birth to pride, arrogance, exclusiveness, hardness, and moral obliquity. Pharisaism, however, could not be maintained without some measure of self-deception. The violent hostility of the Pharisees to our Lord is some indication of their determination to preserve at all costs their self-esteem and to ward off any appeal that would undermine the pattern of their life. 'Perhaps,' says Professor A. B. Davidson (quoted by Dr. Oman in *Grace and Personality*[3], 144), 'mankind is one large Pharisee.' Pharisaism does not belong to one age. It is the arch-enemy of religion in every age, and it is inseparable, wherever it appears, from self-deception.

The question has often been discussed as to whether self-deception is to be traced to ignorance

or conscious dishonesty. According to Philip Leon (*The Ethics of Power*, 257 ff.), the self-deceiver may be described as two persons. One is the executive, the doer, and the other is the talker or apologist who keeps the peace in relation to some imperative which must be placated. The doer is, in fact, the deceiver for it is he who needs to be deceived. 'The self-deceiver does not believe (does not think true) what he says or he would not be a deceiver. He does believe what he says or he would not be deceived. He both believes and does not believe (thinks and does not think) or he would not be *self*-deceived.' This analysis reveals the confusion which self-deception involves. It is in part due to ignorance since it is plain enough that although man is a self-conscious being capable of conceiving himself as the centre of the world, he is hemmed in by contingency and by his relation to Nature and society. But such ignorance has dishonesty as a close partner. There are occasions when every man recognizes the fact of self-deception. He knows that he is playing a part and wilfully ignoring those elements in his own nature which conflict with his self-esteem. Even if it is argued that self-deception is lodged in the convenient limbo we call the unconscious, there is enough evidence in the archives of modern psychology to show that the contents of the unconscious can be brought to the surface and their pretensions recognized. Self-deception is the ally of original sin, and the plea of ignorance becomes its willing instrument.

'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' To uncover our deceptions and to recognize the lie in sin which leads to pride and moral obtuseness will not of itself deliver us. And yet, that is the first step. St. Paul would not have known Christ as Saviour had he not been confronted by Him as Judge. It was then that he realized the depth of his need. He gave to Christ entire freedom to convince him of the truth of his own condition. The verdict was hard to bear, but he accepted it and cast himself upon the mercy of God. He was thus set in a right relationship to God. He was reconciled at long last to reality. The condition of justification is not perfect penitence or complete sincerity, which would mean that no element of deception remained, but a complete reliance upon the merits of Christ and a readiness to be united to Him in His life, death, and resurrection. By faith-union with Him we are indeed delivered from the body of this death, and from the entanglements of self-deception. We are made free to think, to worship, and to serve.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

What Shall I Give Him.

By the Reverend W. Challenor, Walkden, Manchester.

'. . . and opening their treasures they offered unto him gifts. . . .'—Mt 2^{11} (R.V.).

I have just been reading about a kind-hearted old gentleman named Mr. Buffin, who one snowy morning found a little robin on his window-sill. It looked so cold and hungry that Mr. Buffin at once opened the window, took the poor little bird up on his finger, and fed him on breadcrumbs and currants. When he had recovered, Bobby Robin felt very grateful to Mr. Buffin, and began to look round the garden to find a nice present for him. Almost the first thing he saw was an enormous and very red worm just beginning to wriggle out on to a patch of lawn where the snow had melted. Bobby Robin seized it at once, flew in through the open window and placed it on the butter-dish right on top of Mr. Buffin's ration of best butter! Poor Mr. Buffin! But when he had got over the shock I think he must have smiled with pleasure. He knew that to Bobby Robin a fat red worm was the most wonderful thing in all the world, and although he must have smacked his beak over it, he had given it *willingly* to his kind-hearted friend. *A worm!* Yes, but think what a fat juicy worm must mean to a hungry robin on a snowy day. I'm sure Mr. Buffin scraped the top of his best butter and told himself that Bobby Robin was a most noble bird!

About four hundred years ago, round about Christmas time, the Tylers and Thatchers of the ancient city of Chester would trundle a queer-looking waggon, two stories high, to the High Cross and get ready to perform their Nativity Play before the Mayor and all the people. Everyone loved the part where the Shepherds came in to bring their gifts to the Christ Child lying in the manger. The First Shepherd brought a bell, the Second Shepherd a wooden porridge bowl with a horn spoon attached by string, and the Third Shepherd laid his reed pipe at the foot of

the manger. What poor, humble things to offer to the King of all the world! The Three Wise Men were to bring their costly gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, but these rough shepherds could offer only a *bell*, a *bowl*, and a *reed pipe*! It reminds you of the worm Bobby Robin offered to Mr. Buffin! And, in a sense, these humble gifts were very much like the little bird's offering, they were *precious*, and very probably the only worldly goods these poor men possessed apart from their rough sheep-skin cloaks and their crooks. Yet they offered them willingly to the Infant King as He lay in the manger which was really His throne. I'm sure He must have smiled and understood.

What can I give Him,
Poor as I am?

Perhaps not the gold which was the gift of the First Wise Man, or the gold with which King Solomon covered the dome of his Temple; and perhaps not the frankincense which the Second Wise Man carried from afar, or the incense which the priests offered to God at the High Altar; and perhaps not the myrrh which was the third gift of the strangers from the East. But we must not come empty-handed as we come to His manger this Christmastide. There is surely *something* we can bring, even if we happen to be tiny, or not very rich or not very clever. There is the *bell* which stands for our *praise*, and the *bowl* which speaks of our *thanksgiving* for our daily food, and there is the *pipe* which represents our *joy* at His coming. Humble gifts, yes, but very precious to those who give them and to the Christ Child who will receive them.

And, then, there is the very best gift of all—

Yet what I can I give Him,
Give my heart.

The Armchair Spectator.

By the Reverend V. J. Abernethy, B.D., Berwick-on-Tweed.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 7^{21}.

You have sometimes heard people talking about an 'Armchair Critic.' By that is meant one who criticises from the comfort and ease of an armchair; one who passes judgment without experiencing or appreciating the difficulties that those criticised have had to face. The other evening I discovered it is also possible to be an 'Armchair Spectator.' It happened like this.

I went to see the film 'Scott of the Antarctic.' I was keen to see this film because I had read a great deal about Scott's last expedition, and I was eager to see how the film compared with my knowledge and understanding of the journey.

There was much about the film that was commendable. The photography, for instance, gave a very fine representation of the nature of the land, and compared favourably with photographs taken on the journey. The Ice Barrier, the Beardmore Glacier and the Plateau were identifiable. The characters, too, were well represented. I thought Captain Scott too handsome at first, but when he was actually on the expedition he bore a striking resemblance to the real Captain Scott. Indeed, I imagine that one shot taken—the party at the South Pole—was the actual photograph taken on the original expedition, so striking was the resemblance to all five men! Also the film depicted admirably how Edward Wilson towered 'spiritually' (as well as physically) over his mates. It brought out well the effect of his nature and character on the rest of the party.

So, in many ways, the film was excellent. Even small details were correct. It seemed as if nothing had been missed to make the film seem real.

But there was something that brought to me a sense of unreality. It was when Lieut. Bowers showed the thermometer to Captain Scott, and it registered 60 degrees below freezing point. And I was warm! Yes, it was decidedly hot in the cinema and even the film could not convey the sense of acute cold being endured by the explorers. In a flash I realized I was only an 'Armchair Spectator.' For all my reading and knowledge of the expedition I really knew next to nothing about it, and so did the actors in the film. When we came out, I overheard the remark, 'they must have suffered a lot.' Yes, but we hadn't suffered; we had enjoyed two hours' entertainment, sitting back in comfort and warmth. We really had no idea what it had actually been like.

It is good to see 'adventure' films, and read 'adventure' stories. They stimulate us with a like spirit. But let us beware of becoming 'Armchair Spectators.' 'Seeing' and 'reading' are good, but 'doing' is better. It may be true that the spectator sees most of the game, but the player gets the greater thrill. To be an 'Armchair Spectator' is, after all, a second-hand experience. It is not the real thing.

And that is true of Christianity. There are some people who are good 'Armchair Spectators' of the Christian life. They may be quite good talkers about it. But that does not make them Christians, or give them the thrill of the Christian experience. You know what Jesus said 'Whoso-

ever heareth these sayings of mine, and *doeth* them . . . I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.' Don't remain a spectator watching others live the Christian life. Enter into the fray and know the thrill of the experience for yourself.

Christmas-Tide Intercessions.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father,
whose grace was on Christ as He grew in Nazareth,
as we remember His birth and childhood
we pray for the hallowing of our homes.
There let little ones be sheltered from every harm,
and early know the love of Jesus.
Let children learn a childlike faith
that need not change in life's deeper tests.
Bless the love and laughter and comradeship
at fireside and family board.

O God who lookest on all the inhabitants of the earth,
in Jesus' name, who had not where to lay His head,
we pray for the homeless,
those lodging among strangers,
those wearily seeking or waiting for a house.
Uphold loyalty and sustain patience
in hearts whose eager hopes and plans are hindered.

O God of pity, hear our prayer
for those enduring pain or hunger or unkindness,
Show us how we may bring some kindly cheer.
Look in compassion on the displaced victims of war,
shelterless, destitute, in foreign lands, or in their own.
Inspire with love and wisdom
those who make plans to help and guide them.

O God of our salvation,
as we praise Thee that 'unto us a Child is born,'
we pray that all men may learn to sing that song.

O God who sent Thy Son to be Prince of Peace,
let the season bring good will
in the State amid clashing views and interests,
in the Church distracted from its unity.
And to those disturbed by doubt or fear,
to any sure of their guilt but not of Thy mercy,
let there come the peace of God
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

AMEN.

The Christian Year.

CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Glory of Christmas.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR H. KIRKBY, M.A., B.D., LEICESTER.

'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.'—Lk 2^{14}.

The poet, the grammarian, and the theologian are standing near this text. To each in turn we entrust ourselves, that we may hear all that can be said about the meaning of the verse, and about the glory of Christmas.

It is the poet who speaks first. He tells us to notice the shape and the form. These, of course, are not the most important things, but the form of a statement can emphasize or clarify the meaning. The characteristic forms of Hebrew poetry are seen in this angelic song. There is parallelism, and there is antithesis. God and man are set over against one another. God condescends to man in an attitude of good will. Heaven and earth are set over against one another. There is glory to God in heaven, and there is peace on earth to man. These are not just parallel events, but related ones. It is by God's glory, the glory of His love, that there is peace on earth.

We pass fairly quickly from the poet to the grammarian that we may begin to learn the meaning of the verse. He poses a problem first, and does not begin with an explanation. It is the problem of the best reading among the old Greek manuscripts. One word in particular creates difficulty, the word translated as 'good will.' Should we take it in the nominative case, as is done by the Authorised Version? Should we follow the Codex Sinaiticus, which is in the British Museum, and which gives the word in the genitive? The grammarian has no difficulty in persuading us that we must take the genitive, and translate 'of good will.'

The verse now reads in a very simple and straightforward manner. 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of good will.' We are impressed at once. How simple the message of Christmas is now made. When this world is filled with men of good will we may be assured of peace. We want to thank the grammarian for this illuminating remark, and pass on to hear what the theologian has to say. But we cannot escape so easily. Like the Ancient Mariner the grammarian fixes us with his eye to explain further.

The word 'good will' cannot be treated in an easy way like this. It has a history. By careful

reference to passages in the Old Testament, to lexicons, and to learned tomes it is shown that the ' good will ' spoken of in the text is not man's good will to man, but God's good will to man. The text must be translated ' Peace among men of (God's) good will, of (God's) good pleasure.' When the grammarian has insisted on this point he returns to his manuscripts, and leaves us to the theologian.

The theologian takes up the point that the grammarian has just left. You can never understand the theological and doctrinal significance of Christmas until you grasp this point about God's good will rather than man's good will. The trite platitude that is given publicity every Christmas in sentimental stories and articles is that Christmas is the season when we dwell upon the notion of ' peace among men of good will.' Of course we cannot expect peace without men of good will, but the problem is to create the good will. The angels did not make a song about a platitude ; they sing of the grace of God towards men, a grace that can call forth from them that good will which nothing else can evoke.

The sole justification for the celebration of Christmas is in the theology of Christmas. The Christmas glory is the amazing love of God who will not let men go, who takes the initiative in redeeming them, who visits them in the Person of His Son amid the simplicity of the manger. Christmas is the celebration of a mighty act of God, that final act which unfolds His yearning love.

Man's good will to man follows from that. In finding God and being found of Him we find one another. A new motive enters our lives, and we can begin to be peaceable toward one another. There is no justification for our opinions or our prejudices in the face of the revealed will of God in love in Christ.

The emphasis that is thus made on the supernatural character of Christmas is not one that makes the Christian ignore the very real problems of earth. On the contrary, it is the sentimental notions of Christmas that make people ignore our problems. The theological idea brings man face to face with the most practical issues. The Christian celebrating Christmas is not an escapist, or a drug-addict, or any other of the rude things the Marxist delights to call him. He is a man facing the realities of our human situation, and seeking to apply to them the unique, personal contribution of the Christian religion.

We are all well aware that the great need of our time is the establishing of peaceable relations between individuals, between classes, and between nations. Thomas À Kempis says : ' All men desire peace, but very few desire those things which make for peace.' We are content to juggle with the scenery of life, hoping that the play will come right in that way. Laws are devised to try to help ; social schemes are introduced to remove inequalities ; treaties are drawn up between rival nations. But God is left out of account.

Laws and social schemes and treaties may have their place in the ordering of life, but they are quite ineffective without the personal attitude of trust. What is most required is the power to make men trust one another. The glory of Christmas is that the power is offered by God through His approach in Christ, the approach that breaks down the barriers of sin.

There is a further point that the theologian must make before he lets us go. The good will that God shows at Christmas is not a new attitude to which God has turned. As P. T. Forsyth has said, If God can turn *to* it, He might turn *from* it. What is revealed in the Babe of Bethlehem is the temporal expression of the eternal attitude. As God loves there, so has He loved always, and will love always. Just as a shooting star or a comet which travels through the infinite interstellar space comes for a short time within the orbit of the earth, and shows its brilliance, so the darkness has been lighted by God in these few moments of history, and He has shown that eternal, uncreated love which is His very Nature.

Christmas is an affirmation about the nature of God, and also about the nature of man. Perhaps our greatest theological problem is to give an adequate answer to the question of the Psalmist, ' What is man ? ' Is he a psychological animal ? There are many who seem to teach that with their strange psychological theories of Behaviourism. Is he a unit in the State ? There are many who practise that in Communist States, denying any rights to man save the right of obedience to the State. Is man a thing or a person ? The question is being answered in political decisions as much as in theological classrooms. The Christmas season is a time for a renewed declaration of the Christian answer to the question.

There is a worth and a dignity about human nature because God has visited man in redeeming power and love in the Word made flesh. It is Jesus Christ who gives meaning and significance to this strange nature of man.

The theologian who expounds this doctrine to us does not leave the matter thus. He changes into the preacher who wants to win a decision from us. God's mercy manifest in Christ is for *you*. Receive then of His grace so freely given, and by His power, and for His sake be peaceable, loving and merciful to one another.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

Can the Future be Greater than the Past?

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'He that believeth on me . . . greater works than these shall he do.'—Jn 14^{12}.

Rousseau records that in the early eighteenth century the grandees of Venice endeavoured to impress the envoy of the all-powerful Spain by piling their chief treasures on a table in the Doge's Palace. Calmly stooping down, the envoy looked beneath the table and said, 'Gentlemen, your wealth seems to have no roots.' In these euphemistic terms the Ambassador was informing the authorities of Venice that from the economic point of view their republic was finished. The halcyon days of her glory lay in the past and never again would it reach such heights. In a time of grave crisis and revolution like the present this is the feeling which chills men's hearts concerning three things.

First, many people have this idea about their own characters. The poet Hood looked back on his days as a boy with their innocence, wonder, and purity and, surveying what he was now, he felt he had receded morally in the most alarming way, saying,

> But now 'tis little joy
> To know I'm farther off from heav'n
> Than when I was a boy.

Many people in reflective mood have a similar feeling about themselves. In place of the innocence of childhood there is craftiness and guile; the high ideals which seemed natural in the past have been cut by half; things which once seared the conscience are done now with equanimity; and, gazing at the sad moral transformation which has overcome them, they feel that never again will they be as great in character as they were in their younger day. The future can never be as great as the past.

Second, many have this feeling about the national character. Arthur Bryant points out that a hundred years ago people of this island were well versed in the classics. Members of Parliament could quote Latin in their speeches in the House of Commons and be understood, while by the bedside of quite ordinary men a well-thumbed copy of Homer or Horace was to be found when they died. To-day, however, the vast bulk of the nation are ignorant of the classics. That may be bad enough, but what is more alarming is that as a people we have lost many of the fine qualities which distinguished our forefathers. Nobody can gainsay that the late War proved to the hilt that we still possess the national qualities of courage and endurance for a time of crisis. But have we got the qualities which Britons of previous generations had for peace? Have we their courtesy, their mannerliness, their freedom from gross materialism, their honesty of dealing? Many keen observers of our race doubt this and feel somewhat like Froude, who, as he looked back on Elizabethan England, was convinced that Englishmen in his day were degraded in comparison. When all allowance is made for glorifying the past, Britain has passed the high meridian of her glory, they feel, in the matter of her national character which has been her chief wealth and the envy of the world, and never in the future will she reach such lofty heights again.

Third, many have this feeling about Christianity in Europe. Foxe informs us that in his day the people of England were steeped in the Bible. They gathered every day in churches to hear it read and a man was known to table forty pounds for a copy of the Scriptures. Times have changed in that regard with a vengeance. To-day, only a quarter of the population of Scotland goes to church, while in many lands of Europe Christianity has become a minority underground movement. To all appearances, Christianity's sun has set in Europe and good men are depressed with the thought that never again will this faith, which alone can save mankind, flourish in Europe as it once did so vigorously.

This then, in brief, is the outlook of many men upon these things and the vital question is, are they correct in their surmise? To think thus is to reckon entirely without God. It is to forget that God is not dead, and that His power has not run out, but that He can exceed in the days to come anything He has ever done in the past. At a certain bridge spanning the River Dee in Aberdeenshire there is a mark with the inscription that this was the alarming level to which the Dee rose in a certain year in the past, the highest within living memory. When one looks at it he is forced to ask the question, will this cataract ever rise as high again? And as he ponders he is compelled to admit that there is no reason in the world why it may not do so and even exceed that level. This is precisely the claim that the New Testament makes for the power of God. It is true that Christianity avers that the Incarnation, God coming to man in the form of Jesus Christ, is a 'once-for-all,' unrepeatable event. But apart from that unique happening, nobody has any title to limit God's power and declare that any mighty thing He has done in the past, He cannot exceed. He can. This was the warning Jesus felt compelled to issue to His followers on the

very eve of His death when He informed them they would accomplish greater things than He had done. Full well was He aware of the despair that would grip them when the Crucifixion was a reality, but in that hour they must remember that, if they would be up and doing, the Christian faith would sweep the world and accomplish marvels for men to an extent that it had not done in His. To believe otherwise was to forget that God can exceed what He has done in the past.

None of us, alas, may retain the innocence of childhood that Hood and other poets write wistfully of, but, by the grace of God, we can attain to goodness that springs from having our whole nature remade by God : a goodness that is richer than that of childhood just because it has been fashioned out of failure, knowledge of the world and suffering. For does not Max Müller say, ' it is easy to deceive oneself in saying that the more perfect faith is a childlike faith. There is indeed the same glow about the setting sun as there is about the rising sun, but there lies between the two a whole world, a journey through the whole sky and over the whole earth.' Maybe the national character of our island is not as great as it once was but in days to come if men in this land learn again to trust to God and His Word, instead of ignoring Him, by His grace the character of the nation can be elevated to as noble heights as ever it reached and even greater ; for one cannot read the story of Judaism and not marvel that again and again, when the national character had reached lowest ebb, God sent His messengers without fail to recall the nation to the faith it had spurned, and then raised it up to new heights of piety. Christianity, to unseeing eyes, seems doomed to complete extinction in Europe, where once it was so strong, but, if history is any criterion of His ways, God can and will revive that faith until it seeps into the lives of men in Europe far more deeply than ever it has done. Does not Latourette in his *History of the Expansion of Christianity* show us that all the periods of Christian retreat in the past have not only been followed by revival, but when God has acted and revived the faith, each revival has not only recaptured ground lost, but spread farther and influenced men far more deeply than ever before ?

Nobody can read the Gospels without realizing that in the eyes of Jesus Christ every one of His followers should be characterized by hopefulness. In a day of crisis, when faithless men can only despair or be filled with paralysing fatalism, Christian men should have the knack of hoping. If we can do that in our day such an outlook not only keeps us calm amidst the catastrophic events taking place but makes our despairing fellows wonder if, after all, there may not be something in Christianity which can raise men above the flux of events. Such hope is ours if we remember that despite appearances God is alive and that He can exceed what He has done in the past. Yea, our own characters, the character of the nation, and the state of Christianity in Europe, can all, by the grace of God, be greater in the days to come than they have been in the past.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

The Consecrated Life.

By the Reverend H. G. Newsham, M.A., Edinburgh.

' I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.'—Ro 12^1.

Reasonable ! What conceivable considerations can make such a consecrated life reasonable ?

When the merchant of Venice admitted in court that the validity of the bond was indisputable, Portia turned beseechingly to Shylock, ' Then must the Jew be merciful ! ' To which plea Shylock instantly retorted, ' On what compulsion must I ? tell me that.'

It is indeed the question. Why must a man be merciful ? ' Must,' be it noted. Not an optional ' should ' or ' might.' Why may he not, if he pleases, exact an eye for an eye, and require the last letter of his bond ? Why must we be generous and not self-centred ? Why must we, even to our cost, refrain from the lie and reverence the truth ? Why regard as anything but totally ' unreasonable ' a selfless, consecrated life such as the converted Saul of Tarsus came to live, and as a glorious apostolic company have lived down the centuries since. ' It is your reasonable service,' says Paul. ' Reasonable.' That might seem the last word to use of it. A sublime madness if you like. Divine folly. Didn't Paul use that very phrase and confess to being a fool for Christ ? But . . . reasonable ! What could ever make it that ?

Shylock's gruff question, which raises the whole issue of the basis of morals, ' what authority has goodness ? ' and this further question, ' what makes a consecrated life reasonable ? ' are closely tied together. Portia, it will be remembered, replied to Shylock in a moving speech whose theme was that ' mercy is an attribute of God Himself.' It is the only final answer. What the Creator Himself is, the creature may not disdain. Or,

to put it another way, right and wrong are determined by the nature of Ultimate Reality. What is reasonable and what is unreasonable must depend upon what is regarded as man's true nature and destiny. If man is merely a cleverer and more highly trained animal, right and wrong—if they mean anything at all—will be so and so. But if man is made in the image of God, if the spiritual and not the material is his real environment, then right and wrong, what is reasonable and unreasonable, may be something very different.

Have we not been rediscovering this elementary truth in bitter ways of recent years? Have we not seen foul being called fair, vice being called virtue, when morals cut adrift from their religious and Judaic-Christian moorings? The only final human imperative is the Divine Indicative. What God is, man must reverence. That is the compulsion upon Shylock to be merciful. And that is what makes the consecrated life our reasonable service.

So, as you will have noticed, Paul has a little but all-important word 'therefore' preceding his assertion of what is our 'reasonable service.' It is no accident that this list of what the page heading in our Bibles calls 'sundry Christian duties' should be the twelfth and not some much earlier chapter of this letter to the Romans. Paul has written eleven chapters about God, and about the relations of God and man, before he comes to this twelfth chapter on duty. 'What a tedious and roundabout way of getting to the point' does some one say? But wait a moment. It is the same throughout the New Testament. What is right; what is our bounden duty; what is our reasonable service; is always a consequence—an inevitable consequence—of a conviction about the character of God as known to us through His Son Jesus Christ. Take away the conviction, and there is no answer to the question, 'Why ought I?' The order of the Ten Commandments is deeply significant. Belief about God precedes injunctions about the ethical. This is why Paul's appeal 'I beseech you therefore, brethren by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service' is read in Church so soon after Christmas. It is the 'therefore' of Christmas. It is the 'so what' of Christmas. Because of what we know, through Christmas, about the Father in Heaven, something follows imperatively for us all in our everyday life. This love of God for the world; this Divine self-giving; this coming to earth in such great humility, in a stable, as a little child—it all lays compulsions upon us nothing else could ever lay, unless it be that even stronger constraint of the Cross. What is reasonable for us men, in the light of the sacred Cradle and the wondrous Cross, will inevitably be different indeed from what those living in a world unillumined by that Holy Light will call reasonable.

The expression of this 'reasonable service' will vary, of course, not only from person to person, according to the grace given us, or the talents and opportunities, but it will vary also from time to time, with changing circumstance. Ecclesiastes was right at least in this, that there is a time at times for this and a time at times for something very different. 'If the world were in a normal state,' it has been memorably said, 'it would be possible to justify quiescence, luxury, art for art's sake, the piety cognisant only of the soul and heaven. But in a world where every one cannot satisfy his hunger, the real question for the disciples of Him who gave Himself to be crucified is not to know in what measure they may allow themselves lawful things, but in what measure they ought to sacrifice them. Some suggest use without abuse in balanced moderation. But moderation and restraint are not the virtues essential on a burning ship. Embarked upon a civilization on the brink of the abyss, Christians must form themselves into a salvage corps.'

That was said by a French pastor a quarter of a century ago. It is even more urgently true to-day. What is reasonable and permissible on smooth seas and a pleasure cruise is utterly unreasonable and absolutely non-permissible if the ship is in peril of foundering. So powerful is this incentive that the dire need of the world alone has unquestionably inspired selfless and dedicated living in not a few non-professing Christian men and women. But it would be difficult to deny that it is this further incentive, the constraining power of Him who gave Himself, which has produced the infinitely greater harvest of consecration—though many of us must say this to our own shame and in deep penitence. It is He who has inspired lives which have freely and gladly accepted frugal living; denied themselves, for the sake of example and the strengthening of others, many an otherwise legitimate indulgence and pleasure; made the service of their fellows, and not self-advancement to the top of their particular professional ladder, their over-mastering ambition; abandoned leisure for toil, congenial surroundings for city slums, civilization for the primeval forest. The need of the world! The constraint of the Love of Christ, whose own words reverberate down the years 'for their sakes I consecrate myself!' These combine together to point us to our only reasonable service more compellingly than in

almost any other hour since Bethlehem. In such a world as this, and with such a God and Saviour as we have found, or rather who has found us, what other can we do?

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Worship Which God Requires.

BY THE REVEREND T. W. HODGE, M.A.,
HARPENDEN, HERTS.

'The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . . God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.'—Jn 4^{21-24}.

These words spoken in the ever memorable interview with the woman of Samaria are familiar words to many who are not themselves frequent readers of the Christian Scriptures: they have been made familiar by the Anthems of Stainer and Smart. 'God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.' The full significance of those words cannot be understood except in the light of the context, the revolutionary words by which they are preceded, the significance of which has been so strangely ignored; namely, 'neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem shall men worship the Father.' It is no mere question of the *place* of worship: 'Where'er men seek Him God is found, and every place is hallowed ground.' It is rather a question of the accessories which man, in his ignorance, has everywhere judged to be indispensable to worship—temple, altar, sacrifice, priest. Throughout Palestine, in the days of Jesus, there were two such centres of worship—the Jew found his in Jerusalem, the Samaritan found his on Gerizim. Such accessories, when necessitated by tradition and not by truth, by law and not by love, have no essential part in the worship which God requires. When these accessories are made the indispensable and infallible sign of Christian worship and therefore of Christian churchmanship it has to be remembered that they were originally either survivals from Judaism or innovations from Paganism: 'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me . . . in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men. . . . Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition.' This conflict of wills came to a crisis on Calvary. Jesus and His contemporaries, readers of the same sacred Scriptures, believers in the same God, were on opposite sides. The religion of tradition triumphed at the cost of the religion of truth; the religion of temple, altar, sacrifice, priest triumphed at the cost of the religion of mercy and of the love of God; the religion of the flesh at the cost of the religion of the spirit. Beneath the visible triumph there lay the invisible defeat and beneath the visible defeat there lay the invisible victory. 'The things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.' 'Now shall the prince of this world be cast out.' 'In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'

O love of God! O sin of man!
In this dread act your strength is tried,
And victory remains with love:
Jesus, our Lord, is crucified!

The same truth emerges from that incident in the life of Jesus in which His attention was called to the Temple; to the magnificence of its architecture, the costliness of its buildings, the Temple which for centuries has been the spiritual home of His people: 'As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.' Without a pang of regret or fear He could anticipate the desecration and utter destruction of that sacred shrine which had been the glory of the nation. The disappearance of the Temple, its ritual and its priesthood would not mean the disappearance, it might mean, and it did mean, the revival and purification of religion.

During the War a thrill of horror passed through the heart of the world at the thought that St. Peter's, Rome, might possibly be numbered among the casualties of war; for millions of our fellow-Christians the only seat of true Christianity: and, indeed, the loss for multitudes would have been irretrievable. But the disappearance of St. Peter's with its altars, its sacrifices, its priesthood would not necessarily mean the disappearance of the Christian religion; it might even inaugurate a new and nobler return to the religion, 'pure and undefiled,' of Jesus and His apostles.

'Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.' Old Testament scholars assure us that there is no single word in our language adequate to give expression to the full significance of the original word, *khesed*, which is one of the richest in the whole range of Old Testament literature. It will be best learned not from books but from experience, and to learn it thus we should need to know the height and depth of the loving kindness and tender mercy of God; we must know 'the love which passeth knowledge.' That is, we must know what the word meant not

only on the lips of the prophet Hosea but on the lips and in the heart of Jesus. Most happily we are not dependent upon commentaries or dictionaries for our knowledge of the meaning of Jesus. He who said 'Go, learn' said 'Come unto me, learn of me' for I am the love and mercy of the invisible God made visible to men: 'He who hath seen me hath seen the Father.' To learn our lesson we do not go to the books of the learned nor to the men who wrote them: we go to One who

> wrought
> With human hands the creed of creeds
> In loveliness of perfect deeds,
> More strong than all poetic thought.

He is our school, our lesson and our teacher.

The mercy which all men may find in God revealed to us in Christ is to be re-born in the hearts of all mankind and especially in the hearts of all who bear His holy name, *that is the worship which God requires* and without it there is nothing else that really matters.

Mercy is not more necessary to the character of God than it is to the character of man, His child. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect,' perfect in mercy. It is the one sure infallible sign of Christian discipleship. 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy,' the mercy that God loves, 'and to walk humbly with thy God,' and in humbling ourselves to walk with Him, to grow into the likeness of the God whose companionship we share. That, says Jesus, is the very essence of My religion and that is the worship that God requires. To the lack of it we owe all the nameable and the altogether unnameable horrors of two world wars. It is precisely because the religion of temple, altar, sacrifice, and priest has been preferred to the religion of mercy and of the good Samaritan that, for the moment, the Church is engaged in a struggle for her life.

Here, then, it is we come up against a paradox from which at first sight there seems no easy way of escape. Because the early Christians had no temple, erected no altar, burnt no incense, offered no sacrifice, had no official priesthood they were to their pagan neighbours 'atheists' without any knowledge of God though they cherished the worthiest conception of Deity the world has ever known or is ever likely to know. What then were the nobler substitutes which they had to offer? The questioner provides in himself the answer to his own question. 'What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost' 'and that God dwelleth in you?' Not the buildings, but the builders; not the worship, but the worshippers are the temple. When men worship the Father in spirit and in truth the worshipper is transfigured, his body becomes the living temple, his heart the living altar, his life a living sacrifice, himself the priest of the living God. That is an experience in which we all may share. To every one who is willing to listen to the still small voice within each man's soul, and especially to every one who bears the name which is above every name, his body is a temple not made with hands, and in that temple the God who made it for Himself seeks an abiding dwelling-place; his heart is the living altar on which the fires of devotion and self-dedication must be kept for ever burning: his life is to be a daily sacrifice of service and praise to the tender mercy and redeeming love of our Father in Heaven. We are all called to be members of one holy, universal priesthood, living to the praise of Him who called us out of darkness into His marvellous light. 'Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.' It will be a costly lesson, a never-ending lesson, the more we learn the more we find there is to learn. After nearly two thousand years that lesson has not yet been taken to heart; a fruitful lesson which, when thoroughly learned will be productive of one of the most beneficent revolutions of religion the world has ever known.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Standing on God's Ground.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN BAKER, B.A., B.D., BATLEY, YORKS.

'And Naaman said, Shall there not then, I pray thee, be given to thy servant two mules' burden of earth? for thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord.'—2 K 5^{17}.

Naaman, the Syrian general, had been cured of the dread leprosy by the prophet Elisha. Now he returns home a changed man—but changed in more than body. With overwhelming force there has come upon him the challenge of a new and greater God, the Lord God of Israel. So strong is his new faith that Naaman is ready to brave even the anger of the God of Syria, for the Syrian general, like all others at that time, believed that the territories of the gods were limited to the territories of the nations who worshipped them. How could he worship a strange God in his own country? Difficult as the problem must have seemed, Naaman decides that he owes such a debt to the God of Israel that he can henceforth worship Him alone. At last he hits on a plan, and he here

makes the strange request that he be allowed to take two mule-loads of Israelite soil, and set it down in his own home, thus making for himself a sanctuary in the midst of a pagan land. He wanted a patch of God's earth set in the land of idols, where he could stand and worship his new Lord, and live for Him in Syria.

What a venture—and what a risk! To worship a foreign god in his own country; to live a better life in an evil world; to establish an outpost of the true religion within a generation of sinful and careless people. This surely is the lesson that Naaman's action teaches us to-day—that it is our task as Christians to stand on God's earth and seek to represent God's Kingdom before men.

This is no easy task. How can we begin?

1. We must start on our own little plot, knowing that our surroundings are pagan, and convinced that God is calling us to do this. We must, as it were, carry a load of God's earth into our ordinary life, and make a sanctuary there. And we must take our stand on it.

That was Christ's method. He went into the midst of life, evil and tragic as it was, and wherever He touched He left a patch of life that was holy and clean and joyous. He took hold of a sick man and said to him, 'Be thou whole.' He met a sinner, and said, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee. Go, and sin no more.' He put into men's and women's hearts a portion of God's life with which to start afresh. He set under their feet a rock whereon they might stand, and feel sure of God's love and care.

He called Peter the fisherman and said, 'Follow me and I will make you a fisher of men.' Christ saved Peter in his familiar environment; He transformed him in his own occupation. Christ took hold of men and women, and by changing them, made them great enough to change their environment. Christ has shown us that men who believe in God with all their hearts are greater and stronger than outward circumstances or inner weaknesses. Our own age sorely needs to relearn this lesson. The dominant modern belief is in the power of circumstances to shape our lives. The Christian should recover his faith in the invincible power of redeemed lives to conquer and change circumstances. It is high time the Christian Church challenged the world, instead of passively having to defend itself against the challenge of the world. Christ has ever done His work by creating in the midst of everyday life 'patches of life luminous with God.' He has made workmen into workers for God, teachers into spiritual teachers, merchants into godly merchants. Here and there He has put a plot of the new Israel's soil upon that of pagan Syria.

Some years ago on the island of Gemo near New Guinea a women's colony was founded by a Protestant mission. At first it was impossible to get the native women to do anything with the soil. They were afraid to cultivate the soil and plant garden foodstuffs because they were still under the spell of ancient spirits. The gods of the earth still ruled. At last the missionary called the women together and spoke to them. They held a prayer meeting, and, as a result, came to the important decision that the island was henceforth a new place, a new island, under new laws and new ownership. The old spirits and superstitions must have no power in it henceforth, because it now belonged to God, and He would bless and prosper all that was planted there. On the next day all worked with a will—they had made the island belong to God.

We, too, need to start there, and announce that the place where we stand—our home, our work, our whole life—belongs to God.

2. We must believe in the fruitfulness of God's soil, in its power to extend its borders.

Too often the sordidness and selfishness of life around us encroach upon our spirit and cheapen our service, whereas the life of the Christian and of the Church should cast its light on things and lives around us, and claim and sanctify increasing areas of life.

Christ was always making the little plot of God's earth bigger — extending the horizons. Whenever He saw a poor sinner or sufferer shut outside the joy of life He insisted on getting him in and making the circle bigger. Men and women felt the warmth of His saving power touch them, and before they had time to doubt, they were on His side, and His Kingdom was one soul richer.

We may have but a very small plot to begin with, but if we are certain of God *there* we shall soon extend our boundaries, and insist on getting others in. Christ wants to embrace all men; the gospel aims to possess the world by the inclusive power of love:

> He drew a circle that shut me out
> Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
> But Love and I had the wit to win
> We drew a circle that took him in.

A story is told of some soldiers at the battle front during the first World War. One of their comrades had been killed, and sadly they took him to a churchyard behind the lines, and requested the priest's permission to bury him. On hearing that the dead man had not been baptized in the Roman Catholic Church the priest sadly refused permission for him to be buried in consecrated ground. So they dug a grave just outside the boundary fence, and laid

the body there. A few days later, as they were due to leave the district, the soldiers paid a last visit to the grave. They were, however, unable to find the spot. While they were searching, the priest came to them and, with tears in his eyes, explained that he had worried so much over his refusal that on the following morning he had pulled up the churchyard fence with his own hands and had set it around the lonely grave so that it was now in consecrated ground.

Only a churchyard? But when a heart is changed it always results in a widening of boundaries.

Each one, strong or weak, great or small, can establish a small plot of ground which shall be holy to God. And if we are faithful to Him there to begin with, the flowers will begin to grow on it, and the scent will reach beyond its borders. Then in the autumn the winds will blow the seeds on to the neighbouring land and that will blossom too. For if we plant, God will not fail to give increase.

Poetry After Two Wars.

By the Reverend Roy M'Vicar, M.A., Glasgow.

'It is the function and glory of literature,' says a critic, 'to express the unseen in terms of the seen, to communicate by the cunning use of symbols the reality and significance of the inner life.' If this is true of literature in general, it is even more true of poetry. But not all poetry fulfils this function. Some poets continue to write in the traditional manner; others again follow the models of a previous age; but there are some few, prophetic souls, in whom the present is made articulate, through whom the spirit and atmosphere of the times are given expression, by whom contemporary thought and feeling are reflected.

The aim of this article is not to discuss poetry in general, but to compare the significant poetry which was written after the first World War, with that which is being written since the last War. Has the tone of poetry changed? Is the attitude to life expressed in contemporary poetry just an unhappy repetition of what was said twenty-five years ago? What has been the effect of total war as interpreted by the intelligence and insight of the poet?

In 'the years of "*l'entre deux guerres*," ' poetry was a crescendo of negative emotions: disillusionment, futility, despair, doom; and at the same time, that staring, wild-eyed realism which allowed no curve to soften the hard outlines of the future, and no mellowness to tone down the harsh, crude colours of life. A world such as it was, was uncongenial to the poet, so that C. Day Lewis in *Tempt Me No More* felt that he

> . . . must wring
> A living from despair
> And out of steel a song.

Others were concerned with something deeper than this; they saw further into the world's plight, and were unnerved by what they saw. To them the world before 1939 was a dying world; a world, as F. R. Leavis put it, 'in which the traditions are bankrupt, the cultures uprooted and withering, and the advance of civilization seems to mean death to distinction of spirit and fineness of living.' Such is the world Ronald Bottrall saw in *The Future Is Not For Us*, a world which is no more than a 'dead-embered sphere.' There is no future, and men have no real life—only a waiting for death:

> We are dismembered
> Into a myriad broken shadows,
> Each to himself reflected in a splinter of that glass
> Which once we knew as cosmos. . . .

There is not even a past into which we can escape; there is nothing but a present to face without faith, without fear, without friend:

> Remains then but to seize
> Each one alone, his smoky taper
> And climb the stairs, knowing each step in the rear
> Has crumpled beneath like tissue paper,
> Disclosing the blue-black inkblot
> Of vacuity beneath our sinking knees;
> Then to set our fingers on the latch without the hope or fear
> That within there lies the Is or Is Not.

The majority of people were not conscious of this atmosphere of disillusionment; many might even have denied its truth. But the poets who are both more sensitive and more articulate than ordinary people, knew this world and wrote of it. Of them all, surely T. S. Eliot, in his earlier poems,

was the foremost poet of despair, and *The Hollow Men* was his most savage expression of despair. As Mr. Hugh Ross Williamson said, in this poem 'Mr. Eliot is ruthless. There is no comfort' in it. The title of the poem is a symbol of the people of these years, without any real life or any of the spiritual realities associated with real life: hollow men, stuffed men, empty men. This poem is a succession of symbols, each more intensely grim than the last, heaping despair on despair, horror on horror, darkness on darkness:

> This is the dead land
> This is cactus land
> Here the stone images
> Are raised, here they receive
> The supplication of a dead man's hand
> Under the twinkle of a fading star.

This terrible poem, with its last terrible section, reaches an incredible climax in the final quatrain, of which Charles Williams once wrote: 'A traditional poem is varied by a few words, and an entire cold futility absorbs everything. Futile, imbecile, gyratory, we perform our antics.'

> This is the way the world ends
> This is the way the world ends
> This is the way the world ends
> Not with a bang but a whimper.

Our world, like an old man in the senility of his second childhood, ends his senseless, harmless game with the pitiful, chilling whimper of the lunatic which defies description. This whole last section, with its combined symbolism of solemn liturgy of the church, with song and dance of children, is truly 'cold futility.' Here is absolute, unrelieved pessimism; every value, every hope, every faith, torn to shreds, the very soul torn out of man.

Not all people reacted to this world in the same way. The majority, not really aware of it, were yet aware of something which drove them in wild pursuit of pleasure, with a desperation to get what they could out of life while there still was life; flitting and scurrying from one poor thing to another, like children in the last five minutes before bed-time. Others, though they could not bear the vision of the world they saw, were driven by it to seek something more permanent, like W. B. Yeats, whose poetry, in the words of Maurice Baring, 'belongs to the world of those who, while withdrawing themselves from the busy market-place, have looked into their own souls and understood the passions and the dreams of mankind, of those who have wandered in the secret places of Nature, and have gone beyond into the unknown land which reaches right up to the shores of Lethe.'

To this world the War came as a release—if not from despair, at least from the tedium and monotony of despair. If death was coming, let it come with a blaze and a blast! Let the end of the world after all be not a 'whimper' but a 'bang.' If men could not break out of the grip of Fate, at least they would smile and not whine. Even that was worthwhile. And with this new courage, men began to lift their eyes to the horizon again, to see with a new kind of hope, to look at life with a realism no less open-eyed, but the realism of faith not of despair. How has this new spirit shown itself in present poetry?

Jung once made this far-reaching statement: 'Poets are the first in their time to divine the darkly moving, mysterious currents, and to express them according to the limits of their capacity in more or less speaking symbols. They make known, like true prophets, the deep motions of the collective unconscious. . . .' Modern poetry is therefore significant to the extent that it creates adequate symbols. There is still, in much new poetry, a feeling of living in a world on the verge of disaster. There is no feeling of danger past, of a safe and secure life, but rather of forces of destruction ever ready to leap out upon an uneasy and unwary humanity. There is danger, but not doom. The precipice is near, but we need not go over. This tense atmosphere is finely caught in R. N. Currey's poem, *A Dam in India*.

> I feel uneasy living beneath this dam.

Our world, like the dam, is

> a world propped up
> By boards that curve and strain; through sizable cracks
> The waters splash and spray along the rim.
> . . . Lying here,
> Under the altas-shoulders of this dam,
> I hear the waters walk above my head.

A more specific social concern, which has yet nothing to do with parties and policies, is nowhere more clearly expressed than in the poetry of Alex. Comfort. He has defined the poet's function as being the mouthpiece of those sections of society who cannot make themselves heard; in the poet, the voiceless multitudes become articulate. Thus a note of rebellion sounds through his poetry, calling for a refusal to obey the forces of authority, the all-powerful State, for they are the forces of death. In *Song of the Heroes*, he imagines the fallen heroes of the War coming back for vengeance on those who sent them with one message for those who remain:

> Obedience is death—
> If you are willing to die, then choose obedience.

This poet is haunted by the modern scene, by a sense of restlessness because of the tragedy of life and the pressure of events, by a sense of the helplessness of man caught in forces too strong for him. Nor has he any awareness of any power greater than man; there is no help beyond man's own effort, and there is no certainty of victory:

Because our shout into the cup of sky
brings back no echo, brings back no echo ever:
because man's mind lives at his stature's length

because the stars have for us no earnest of winning
because there is no resurrection
because all things are against us, we are ourselves.

There was, however, a new faith in man and his possibilities born in the War—not the old humanism, but a belief in his spiritual nature and faculties. The qualities displayed by men in danger show possibilities not yet realized, which, harnessed to tasks of peace, could make a new world. This faith has been strongly and insistently urged by Louis MacNeice, for example, in *The Kingdom*, a buoyant and invigorating poem in praise of heroes:

Subjects all of the Kingdom but each in himself a king.
These are the people who know in their bones the answer
To the statesman's quiz and the false reformer's crude
Alternatives and ultimatums. These have eyes
And can see each other's goodness. . . .

With such as these, there need be no catastrophe for civilization:

. . . yes, they have faults
But are the chosen . . .
Of these, of such is
Your hope, . . .
Of such is your future if it is to be fruitful,
Of such is your widow's cruse, your Jacob's ladder,
. . . . . .
Of such is the epilogue to your sagas of bronze and steel,
Your amnesty, your advent, your Rebirth,
The archetype and the vindication of history;
The hierarchy of the equal—the Kingdom of Earth.

Along with this faith in man, there is the recognition of the validity of artistic vision and of spiritual experience. In none has this been more persistently and consistently expressed than in T. S. Eliot; and one of the many great values of the *Four Quarters* is the way he makes this point again and again. As one critic says of *East Coker*, 'It is written by a poet who believes that man is a spiritual being.' Man's spiritual experience is valid, and it is valid because man at heart is spiritual; he was not made to be alone, his whole nature points to Something beyond himself, his whole being is planned, as it were, for communion with that which is behind all experience. Thus the deepest urge of human nature, to which all art and music and poetry contribute, is for this communion:

We must be still and still moving
Into another intensity
For a further union, a deeper communion
Through the dark cold and the empty desolation,
The wave cry, the wind cry, the vast waters
Of the petrel and the porpoise.

Eliot is also deeply and intensely conscious of man's need for 'rebirth' if this communion is ever to be realized. Faith in man, as man, is folly and futility; but man reborn, man united with God, can build a new world. Echoing through and through his later poetry there runs, like a refrain, the theme, 'In my end is my beginning.'

These are some of the new notes in the new poetry; new notes, yet are they not old too? There are, of course, many other voices saying many other things, but these, I believe, are the important themes which will mark the poetry of the next generation. These are the melodies which will be developed and expanded with infinite variation and mutation by poets and poets-to-come. There is, however, in the poetry of T. S. Eliot, one contrast which seems to me to sum up the whole change in poetry after the first World War and after the second. In his poem quoted in the earlier part of this paper, *The Hollow Men*, he uses with really desolating effect the words 'For Thine is the Kingdom.' Occurring as they do in the terrible last section—a kind of litany cramped between childish refrains—they combine hollow mockery of a routine ritual chant with the monotonous babbling chant of a lunatic. Commenting on these words, Hugh Ross Williamson says: 'T. S. Eliot constantly uses quotations to evoke vast associations. The simple "For Thine is the Kingdom," with its immediate ascription of Almighty Power, and its secondary reminder of the Perfect Prayer, implies also a definition of God. In addition, it provides a violent contrast between the impotence of man, dogged by the Shadow, and the power of God.'

Over against this there is his use of the image

of a bell in *Dry Salvages* to call up almost identical associations of God and prayer and man's need of God; but this time with faith and hope:

> And the ground swell, that is and was from the beginning,
> Clangs
> The bell.

Miss Helen Gardner, noting some of the 'vast associations' evoked by these simple words, says: 'The reminiscence of the doxology gives us the implication of the symbol of the ground swell, which makes itself felt in our hearts by the bell. The bell sounds a warning and a summons: it demands a response. Like the bell of the Angelus, it is a call to prayer, and a commemoration of the mystery of the Incarnation; like the bell at the consecration it is a call to worship and announces the presence of Christ; like the tolling bell it reminds us of our death and calls us to die daily.'

Could poetry rise to greater heights of purpose than that? Here, in this contrast, we have the whole change from despair to hope, from fear to faith, from futility to purposefulness. Where Eliot is in advance of his contemporaries is in having found his solution in the acceptance of orthodox Christianity. This does not in itself make him a greater poet, but it does make him a more significant one. There is a future for man and his civilization, he declares, but the way to that future lies through repentance, consecration, and prayer. And when poetry, using all the resources of words and creative symbolism, gives this faith valid and convincing expression, then the poet, in Jung's phrase, is a 'true prophet.'

One important function of poetry should be to refuse to become obsessed with the contemporary scene and its passing fashions, and catch and keep the voice of the Eternal and the permanent. This note is too seldom heard; our poets seem to be as bewildered and beaten as the rest of us. But one American poet, Dorothy Quick, has this deeper undertone in one of her best poems. When all the things which now seem big and important have vanished; when all the pomp and parading, the noise and rush and smoke and fury of events and crises have passed 'into the dim penumbra of a dream,' what then?

> Still there will be that silent, secret place
> Wherein we kneel, wherein we ask for grace.

Contributions and Comments.

The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii.

Dr. Black's attempt, in The Expository Times for August 1949, to discover *der leidende und der sterbende Messias* in *The Testament of Levi*, 18[6], is ingenious and interesting. But certain qualifications suggest themselves.

To begin with, at the crucial point the text is uncertain. Charles's translation, 'as from Abraham to Isaac,' represents the reading of the Armenian version. Five of the Greek MSS.—*a b g h i* in Charles's enumeration—read 'as from Abraham the father of Isaac' [ὡς ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ πατρὸς Ἰσαακ]. This is adopted by F. Schnapp in his translation of the *Testaments* in Kautzsch's *Die Apokryphen u. Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* Four others of the Greek MSS.—*a c d f*—have the contraction πῆς after the word Ἀβραὰμ. Charles thinks this stands for πρὸς, and that πατρὸς has found its way into the five MSS. listed above as the result of a misunderstanding and a wrong expansion of the contraction (*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [1908], 64, note *in loc.*). The remaining Greek MS. has ὡς πῆς Ἀβ. καὶ Ἰσ. καὶ Ἰακώβ—where almost certainly πῆς = πρὸς—and the Slavonic version omits the phrase altogether. Very probably Charles is right to adopt the reading of the Armenian version, but the MS. evidence suggests that at a comparatively early date the interpretation of the expression was uncertain.

But let Charles's version be accepted. Dr. Black takes the phrase 'as from Abraham to Isaac' to refer *only* to 'with the Father's voice.'[1] He is helped in this by the punctuation of Charles's translation, which puts a comma after the word 'santification,' and runs 'With the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac' together in a single line. But this is quite arbitrary, and it is not even adopted by Charles in the reconstruction of the

[1] So, apparently, does P. Riessler in his rendering of the passage in *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*, 1170:

> 'Die Himmel öffnen sich
> und aus dem Heiligtum der Herrlichkeit
> steigt Heiligheit auf ihn herab
> mit väterlicher Stimme,
> wie die von Abraham an Isaak.'

Greek text given in his *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [1908] which runs thus :

Οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται,
καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς δόξης ἥξει ἐπ' αὐτον ἁγίασμα
μετὰ φωνῆς πατρικῆς ὡς ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς Ἰσαακ.

It is surely possible to adopt here the sense that ' sanctification ' will come upon the Messiah from the heavenly temple by means of some utterance of his Divine Father as a similar sanctification came upon Isaac through some utterance of his father Abraham. That this is so is strongly suggested by the next sentence, in *v.*[7], which seems to mean that the Divine glory, the Shekinah, will rest on the Messiah through some word spoken over him. It can be shown that, on this basis, a meaning may be suggested for the words ' as from Abraham to Isaac ' which is better suited to the context than the one proposed by Dr. Black.

It is quite true that the only words recorded in canonical Scripture to have been spoken by Abraham to Isaac are those of Gn 22[8] ; but it is a large assumption that these are the only words which the writer of *The Testament of Levi* could have conceived of as being uttered by Abraham to his son, for in the period of the composition of *The Testament* that embroidery and expansion of the text of Scripture, which is usually called *Midrash*, was already well under way. If the interpretation of the passage under discussion given in the preceding paragraph has any validity, we should expect Abraham's words to Isaac to have taken the form of some kind of *blessing*, and by the first century B.C. Jewish tradition had come to record a blessing uttered by each patriarch over his descendants before his death, transmitting to them the mercies of Yahweh's covenant, made through Abraham, with his people. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* itself is built up of such Midrashic blessings, and *The Book of Jubilees*, which appears to have been used in *The Testaments* (C. C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature* [1945], 128), actually gives a long blessing of Isaac by Abraham in 21[1-25], while others are to be found in other pseudepigraphical writings. Isaac occupied a special place in tradition as being *the* son, Abraham's only son, the guarantee of God's promises, and the sole person who could be heir to them. This is already very strongly marked in P (Gn 18[19]), where it is explicitly said that God makes His covenant with Isaac also, and in Gn 28[4] [P] Isaac transmits the blessing of his father Abraham to Jacob. It is noteworthy that, according to *The Testament of Levi*, 18[8a], the verse immediately following the passage under consideration, the rôle of the coming Messiah is to transmit ' the majesty of the Lord ' to the chosen people.

It may be contended, then, that the words ' as from Abraham to Isaac ' refer to a tradition of a blessing uttered by Abraham over his only son Isaac, by which the benefits of the Divine covenant were transferred to him. The coming Messiah, as uniquely the Son of God, is blessed in a similar way by his heavenly Father. Charles is surely right when he writes that in *v.*[6] the Messiah is ' being addressed by God as Isaac was by Abraham, *i.e.*, as a son.' But Dr. Black's suggestion that the Divine voice here is ' the voice of parental authority calling for the obedience of a beloved Son to the point of complete readiness to offer Himself in sacrifice ' is quite alien to the whole tenor of ch. 18. The chapter is entirely concerned with the exaltation and triumph of the Messiah, conceived along traditional Jewish lines ; there is really nothing in it resembling Is 53[7] which Dr. Black thinks ' may not be far from the author's mind.' Any cogent proof of a Messiah between the Deutero-Isaianic servant and Jesus Christ whose work was conceived by Judaism in sacrificial terms is still to be sought.[1]

J. R. Porter.

Oriel College, Oxford.

Was Peter the Companion of Cleopas on Easter Afternoon ?

The first appearing of Jesus as given in the Gospel of Luke is recorded by him in 24[13-35]. It is an account of an appearing on Easter afternoon to two going to Emmaus, one being Cleopas and the other unnamed.

All scholars have noted the value of this report. Wellhausen pointed out its Aramaic colouring and thought it was a translation from an original report in the Aramaic language. Goguel, T. K. Rordam, George A. Barton, T. Korff, A. M. Perry, have held it was an account from a very early Jerusalem source. Schmiedel held it to be a most reliable report that we have, and points out evidence that makes it appear to be based on actual historic event, and with him agreed the late Professor K. Lake.

Dibelius says the report stands in Luke substantially in its original form, which is a very primitive record. The conservative school of critics all accept the report as of great value. It is a sober, restrained narration of the first risen manifestation which Luke gives us here ; and

[1] Cf. the remarks of C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, 219.

that great authority on ancient Eastern history, Eduard Meyer, takes Luke as a good historian of the type of Polybius and Livy, and places great value on his writings. I think it safe to say that this report of the Emmaus Appearing will stand up at first in historical reliability among the reports of the several appearings which we have in our Gospels.

There has been much speculation as to who was the companion of Cleopas to whom Jesus appeared, and a respectable group of scholars have believed it to have been Peter, and thus this report by Luke is the account of that initial appearing to Peter, of which Paul speaks (1 Co 15^5). H. K. Luce, in *The Cambridge Bible*, takes this view: Voltmer says 'Peter was definitely the companion of Cleopas and shows the fulfilment of the promise in Mk 16^7.' Also Schmiedel, Resch, and Renan, who wrote, 'If Peter were the companion of Cleopas, carrying on a talk with Jesus and being reinstated, it makes a very natural account.'

Hugo Grotius, having the more liberal view as to inspiration of the canonical Scriptures than the Calvinists, was the earliest post-reformation scholar to study the New Testament with a really scientific mind, and noting that Origen in seven different places speaks of Peter as the companion of Cleopas, comments upon Origen, by saying that he could not see where Origen got his information unless he had a copy of Luke which read in 24^{34} the Greek '*legontes*' instead of '*legontas*.' The former nominative would make Cleopas do the 'saying' in the English translation, while the latter accusative makes it one of the Eleven who does the 'saying.'

In the elaborate and careful work of Schrivener on the text of the fifth century MSS. given by Theodore Beza to Cambridge University in England in 1581, we find a text where, as Grotius shrewdly supposed, it is the nominative 'legontes.' Now Schrivener contends that the Bezae text is the old 'Western' text used by Irenaeus, and taken by him to Gaul when he became Bishop there in A.D. 170. (See also comment on this Bezae text in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lx. [October 1948] 25).

If this text of Beza be accepted instead of the King James text, then we have in Luke's very early report an account of the appearing of Jesus, 'First to Peter, then to the Twelve,' in his 24^{13-88}. Which is just the testimony we would expect from Luke as a companion of Paul, who made it his Credo of the Church, for Eduard Meyer and others have held the primitive Credo to be just that, and that the other four appearings in 1 Co 15^{5-9} are Paul's own addition.

I accept as true the views of Meyer that Lk 24^{39-43} is a clumsy interpolation in Luke's original report of the appearing to Peter and the Twelve.

Let Us Compare the Bezae Text with that in the King James Bible. Bezae has a smooth, natural sentence, such as we would expect to find in a MSS. by Luke; it reads:

> 'As they drew nigh to the village . . . he [Jesus] made as though to go further, and they constrained him, saying (legontes), "Abide with us." . . . And they arose and returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven and those that were with them, saying (legontes) "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon."'

Using the name by which Peter is called in the earliest tradition, it is Cleopas who speaks to the eleven.

Now this text agrees with the general sense of several passages in the New Testament reports of the events of Easter day, while the accepted text, with its *legontas*, does not so agree.

(*a*) It agrees with Mk 16^{13}, where Mark says it is the Two who do the talking and not the Eleven.

(*b*) It agrees with *v.*^{37}, where the group is affrighted, which would not be their attitude were the group doing the 'saying' and telling the Two of the fact of an appearing to Peter.

(*c*) It preserves an account of the appearing to Peter and the Twelve which if, as Paul says, it were the Credo of all the Apostles, would surely have been preserved; thus it agrees with Paul's 1 Co 15^{5-9}.

(*d*) It agrees with the picture in other accounts of the things that were happening. Peter had become separated from the rest, and was with this Cleopas rather than with the others of the Eleven.

(*e*) It agrees with such Patristic testimony as Origen, and also Eusebius, who seems to have had the Bezae text in mind when he wrote: 'Cephas is the same as Simon, who was also Peter, and to him the Lord appeared before he appeared to the Eleven, because Peter had a zeal above all.'

(*f*) If it were *legontas*, and one of the Eleven did the speaking and announced Christ had risen and appeared to Peter, it would not be accurate, for according to Luke's own record He had not at that time appeared to the Eleven or any of them.

How did the Error of the Accepted Text Creep In? If we would take the Bezae text instead of the accepted, we should find some explanation of the divergence between the *legontes* and *legontas*. This is not hard to do. A single stroke of the pen, or a mark showing through from the opposite side, would account for the change of the vowel epsilon to alpha in the last syllable of the word.

The account of the appearing of the Risen Jesus

to Peter and the Twelve, as given in Lk 24^{13-38} is the most sane, natural, and probable report of the Risen Appearings that we have, and is beyond doubt bringing to us the actual first account circulated in Jerusalem and among Christians, as says Paul in 1 Co 15^{5}.

It is an artless, direct, compelling account of what actually happened, and it has no trace of the later attempts to show a physical resurrection rather than one in a 'heavenly' body as Paul calls it.

Over and over again it must have been told and re-told, and when Luke was there in Jerusalem, 58–60, he heard it, as he had heard it from Paul, and he makes it the basic report of the resurrection of Jesus, following his use of Mark's account up to the appoint of an actual appearing.

Mark was written early, while living voices were telling with great effect, of the appearings,[1] and as Mark was writing only 'The Beginnings' of the Gospel, Mk 1^{1}, he did not mention any appearing.

Or it may be that B. Weiss was right in his suggestion that Mark wrote a Part 2, which followed his Gospel, and from which the writer of Ac 1^{3}–2^{18} takes the bulk of his account. Blass and Briggs accept this view and Eduard Meyer indicates some such situation. Thus Lk $24^{13-37.\ 44-48}$ was originally a Marcan account of the appearings on Easter day as Paul preached 'First to Peter, then to the Twelve.' As Eduard Meyer so well said, Luke-Acts was originally one book and who ever separated it into two books shows in ch. 24 of the Gospel some clumsy work.

I always read as my Easter lesson, Paul's words, 1 Co 15^{1-9} and then Lk $24^{13-38.\ 44-48}$, speaking of it as Luke's account of the Easter day appearings mentioned by Paul, 'First to Peter, then to the Twelve.'

ROLAND D. SAWYER.

Ware, Mass., U.S.A.

[1] See article by A. S. Barnes, in *London Review*, September and October 1904.

Recent Foreign Theology.

More Swedish Studies. From the vigorous New Testament School of Anton Fridrichsen at Uppsala a twelfth volume of the series *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* has now appeared,[1] containing five short studies. Two-thirds of the volume are devoted to a grammatical study by G. Rudberg on 'The Participle in the New Testament.' In addition to a review of its use in the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, the Johannine literature and the Epistles, the study passes beyond the New Testament to the Hermetica and other Greek literature. This study is followed by another from the same writer's pen on 'The Apocalypse and the Enneads.' Next come some 'Coniectanea' by A. J. Festugière on the reading of some passages in the Hermetica and Papyri. H. Riesenfeld then adds a supplement to his earlier study of 1 Co 13 in *Coniectanea*, x.,[2] arguing that 'sounding brass' is a reference to Hellenistic cults, while A. Fridrichsen concludes with a note on 'From Faith to Faith, Rom 1^{17}.' The studies of Festugière and Riesenfeld are written in French, and the others in German.

From the same Uppsala School in the series *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses* a tenth issue has appeared containing a study by B. Noack on 'The Kingdom of God in Luke,'[3] devoted to Lk 17^{20-24}, and mainly to the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν in *v.*[21]. Here we have a survey of the history of its exegesis from the Papyri to the present day, followed by an examination in the light of the thought of Luke, leading to the conclusion that it should be translated 'in your midst' (*mitten unter euch*).

A further Swedish study comes from the pen of H. Riesenfeld, who writes on *The Resurrection in Ezekiel xxxvii. and in the Dura-Europos Paintings.*[4] He first argues that the idea of resurrection was not a late borrowing from Persian sources, but had its roots in ancient Canaanite ritual, and especially in association with the great festivals of Passover and Tabernacles. He maintains that both of these were New Year festivals—in contrast to Snaith,[5] who maintains that Passover was not a New Year festival. Riesenfeld thinks that Ezk 37 has behind it the ritual act and cultic drama of the death and resurrection of the king though it is a

[1] *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, xii., edited by A. Fridrichsen and H. Riesenfeld [1948] (Gleerup, Lund; Kr. 3.00).

[2] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lviii. [July, 1947], 277.

[3] *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, x.: *Das Gottesreich bei Lukas, eine Studie zu Luk.* 17^{20-24}, by B. Noack [1948] (Gleerup, Lund, und Munksgaard, Copenhagen; Kr. 2.50).

[4] *The Resurrection in Ezekiel xxxvii. and in the Dura-Europos Paintings* [1948] (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift [1948], xi.) (Lundequistska Bokhandeln, Uppsala, and Harrassowitz, Leipzig; Kr. 1.50).

[5] Cf. *The Jewish New Year Festival* [1948].

genuine vision and not a mere representation of a cultic scene. He holds that it was read in the liturgy of the Passover before the time of our Lord, and makes the suggestion that it lies behind Mt 27^{51-53}. He stresses the connexion of the Resurrection with the Messianic Age, and brings evidence from the paintings of the Dura Europos synagogue to show that the representation of the Resurrection is there depicted as staged on the Mount of Olives (cf. Zec 14^{14}), which is rent by an earthquake—as indicated by a falling house on its slope. Within its brief compass this study offers an acute and learned contribution to the student of the development of the idea of the Resurrection.

New Testament Studies. From Switzerland, too, Biblical studies continue to flow. Amongst the latest works to appear are two volumes from Zürich. The first is by Professor W. G. Kümmel, and is devoted to a study of *The Conception of Man in the New Testament*,[1] in which the New Testament thought is examined in four chapters, dealing with the teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptics, the teaching of Paul, the Johannine theology and the thought of the remaining parts of the New Testament. The author recognizes differences within the New Testament writings while yet finding an underlying unity, and concludes that despite the varying terminology and emphasis, the teaching is fundamentally the same throughout the New Testament in that man is everywhere regarded as created by God for His service, but a sinner before God until redeemed by Jesus Christ. The study is well documented with references to modern literature, including the most recent.

The second work is by Professor Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen, and is devoted to the *Extra-Biblical Sayings Attributed to Jesus*.[2] It is well known that some sayings not included in the Gospels are attributed to our Lord, though it is not generally realized how many there are. Some stand in the New Testament outside the Gospels; some in manuscript additions to the New Testament text; some in the Fathers; and some in the Papyri. Here twenty-one of these sayings are collected and studied, including the one treated in the author's contribution to the Fridrichsen Festschrift.[3] Altogether he has given us a most useful collection, and the interest the author has found in audiences to whom he has lectured on the subject will be shared by a wider circle of readers.

The Grace of Christ. Books dealing with the history of some aspects of Christian theology abound, but histories of the doctrine of Grace are rare. Such a history, though limiting itself to salient points and selected names amongst the theologians of the centuries, has been written by Professor H. Rondet, under the title *Gratia Christi*.[4] An opening chapter on paganism finds a measure of preparation for the doctrine there, while one on the Old Testament finds the theology of Grace to be virtually, though not formally, revealed there. In contrast to the essential Pelagianism of Pharisaism the author next reviews the message of Grace in the Gospels and its elaboration in the teaching of Paul. The Greek Fathers are then epitomized in the title of a chapter on 'The Divinization of the Christian,' followed by a study of the teaching of St. Augustine. Pelagianism, Augustinianism, and Semi-Pelagianism are next considered from the point of view of the doctrine of Grace, followed by some chapters on the mediæval theologians, culminating in an outline of the Thomist synthesis. The modern period is introduced by a study of Luther and Calvin ('Luther sets a gulf between the Law and the Gospel; Calvin reconciles them'), which is followed by an account of the Council of Trent, and then of the teaching of Baius, Jansen, Petau, and Scheeben. While the book is a far less complete survey of the history of the doctrine than can be found on some other aspects of Christian theology, it gives an excellent outline. Its objectivity and learning (the latter reflected in the richly documented footnotes) give it high value for all students of the history of doctrine. An appendix cites the decrees of several Councils.

Language and the Gospel. Dr. Goro Mayeda, the Japanese lecturer on the New Testament in the University of Geneva, whose earlier work in German on Papryus Egerton 2[5] has been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,[6] has now published a study in French under the title *Language and the Gospel*.[7] In his first chapter he begins with the

[1] *Das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* [1948]. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, xiii. (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich: Fr. 5.50).

[2] *Unbekannte Jesusworte* [1948]. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, xvi. (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 7.00).

[3] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lx. [April, 1949], 191.

[4] H. Rondet, S.J., *Gratia Christi: Essai d'histoire du dogme et de théologie dogmatique* [1948] (Beauchesne et ses Fils, Paris).

[5] *Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment Papyrus Egerton 2 und seine Stellung in der urchristlichen Literaturgeschichte*, 1946.

[6] See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lix. [Jan. 1948], 108.

[7] G. Mayeda, *Le langage et l'Évangile* [1948] (Editions Labor et Fides, Geneva; Fr. 5.00).

story of the Tower of Babel, and goes on to consider the variety of languages in the milieu of Israel and the mixed character of Hebrew itself, and in the second the variety of languages found in Palestine in the time of our Lord, who is held to have spoken Aramaic and Greek, while Hebrew was still the sacred language of the Jews, and Latin must have been heard, though it did not play a great part. Dr. Mayeda next studies the story of Pentecost and concludes that the disciples spoke in Greek and not in foreign languages or in glossolaly. The dispute between the Hellenists and the Hebrews is next considered, and then Paul's low opinion of glossolaly compared with prophecy, which is found to be the confession of Christ and testimony for Him. Word and Wisdom in the New Testament are next treated, and the author finds that when the Word of God is exalted, the emphasis is on 'of God.' Hence the Spirit is more fundamental and more important than the Word. The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel he regards as of apologetic intention, and the doctrine of the Word was not developed, so that the Word was never admitted into the Trinity. He concludes that the Bible does not overvalue language, and does not look forward to the restoration of a single universal language. Language is of less importance than the purpose to which it is put, and the Spirit who directs its use is more important than the instruments He uses. It will be seen that at some points the author rejects commonly held views, and this bald summary will indicate that throughout it is worthy of attention. On the date of Hammurabi (p. 19) and on the alleged uncivilized character of the Horites (p. 20) he is not quite in touch with recent sources of knowledge. But both of these questions lie outside his own New Testament field.

Old Testament Commentaries in Modern Greek. Professor B. Vellas, of the University of Athens, has published the first three volumes of a commentary on the Old Testament written in modern Greek. These volumes deal with some of the Minor Prophets, namely, Amos, Hosea, and Micah-Joel-Obadiah.[1] Each prophet is introduced briefly with an account of the compilation of the book, a section on the prophet's life and times, and an estimate of him as prophet and writer. To this is appended an excellent bibliography, which shows the wide range of the author's reading, and indicates that he is abreast of modern scholarship. His reading has not been confined to the work in any one country, and while there is little that is original in his commentaries, he has ably and successfully mediated to his readers the fruits of scholarship. When the paucity of modern works in Greek is remembered—for no other scholarly work on this scale is available—this is no unimportant task, and it may confidently be expected that Biblical studies will be greatly fostered by this venture.[2] In the body of the work he gives a translation from the Hebrew into Modern Greek, followed by the Septuagint text in smaller type, and a full commentary on the text. This in general follows the dominant school in the assignment of passages to later hands, shown by placing the text within brackets, though the author is more sparing of emendation than some commentators have been. Such passages as Am $2^{4f.}$ 9^{11-15} are regarded as secondary, but while the theory of twofold authorship of the Book of Joel, common in German work but less common in English, is here presented to the reader, the author prefers to follow the view that the locust plague could well be a presage of the Day of the Lord and lead on to the eschatological part of the book. Instead of following the usual ὁ Κύριος of the Septuagint for the Hebrew יהוה, Professor Vellas uses in his translation the form ὁ Γιαχβέ. The books are excellently printed, though some misprints will be found in the titles of foreign books.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

[1] B. Vellas, ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΠΑΛΑΙΑΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ, (1) ΑΜΩΣ [1947], (2) ΩΣΗΕ [1947], (3) ΜΙΧΑΙΑΣ-ΙΩΗΑ-ΟΒΔΙΟΥ [1948] (Aster, Athens).

[2] In the Greek Journal Θεολογία Professor Vellas published in English a short account of 'Old Testament Studies in the Modern Greek Orthodox Theology,' in vol. xix. [1948].

Entre Nous.

A Modern Biography.

Everybody knows that Dorothy Sayers, breaking out of her accustomed province, has written on matters theological with both point and passion. And now there comes a fascinating book, central to religion, devised and compiled by another member of the inner circle of our mystery story writers.

In an engaging Preface Mr. Freeman Wills Crofts tells us that his book came into being 'as the result of a criticism of the Gospels, which said in

effect that they contained so many inconsistencies and contradictions that large portions could not be accepted as the records of the actual facts.

'This being opposed to what the writer had been brought up to believe, he determined to test it for himself. He began by trying to piece together the accounts of certain selected incidents given by different Evangelists. So far from finding inconsistencies and contradictions, he was struck by the accuracy with which the stories dovetailed.

'But the work brought home to him something else which, though well known to others, he had not realized: the obscurity of much of the text.' It then occurred to him that for what he calls the 'theologically unlearned' the meaning of these obscurer passages would be made clearer if the sense of them, as interpreted by the best commentators were inserted instead of the actual Scripture text. The thing grew on him, became, he says, a hobby. And ultimately he has sent out *The Four Gospels in One Story*: Written as a Modern Biography (Longmans: 8s. 6d. net). To my mind the result is masterly, and highly to be commended. He has worked solely from the various English translations, now a goodly number; but he has worked hard and well. All the verses in the four Gospels are incorporated in his unified version. Some of them are set out of their familiar place; and, on occasion, a phrase, not in the Greek, is added to make things clearer. But this is carried out with reverence and a sound judgment. And always a literal rendering of such passages is given in the excellent notes appended to each chapter. To me the effect is much like what happens to a man with dimming eyes when he puts on his spectacles, and the blurred print leaps out into distinctness. But let the reader judge for himself. Letting the book fall open of itself, one lights on this: 'The disciples were extremely concerned. They looked at one another and began to question among themselves, wondering whom he meant and which of them should do this.

'"Is it I, Master?" they asked one by one.

'"It's one of the twelve," he answered; one who has shared his meals with me: that's the man who will betray me."

'Reclining against Jesus at the table was his favourite disciple. Simon Peter signed to him.

'"Tell us who he means," he whispered.

'The disciple leant back on Jesus' breast.

'"Master, who is it?" he breathed.

'"It's the one," Jesus responded, "to whom I give this piece of bread when I've dipped it in the dish."

'Then he dipped the bread and gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot.

'"Surely it's not I, Master?" protested Judas.

'"Is it not?" Jesus answered.

'After he had eaten the bread the devil again took possession of Judas.

'"What you're going to do," said Jesus, knowing what had happened, "do quickly."'

Two things are brought home forcibly by this volume. And the first is how small the book is which has made so huge a mark upon the world. And the second is, given these Gospels, how inevitably that immense impression had to be.

It was a catholic-minded Orientalist, one of the very greatest of them who said, Heap up the other sacred books of the world on your left hand. But on your right hand set the Gospels alone.

They are certainly unique.

One hopes that Mr. Crofts' venture will meet with the fullness of success that is its due.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Isaiah liii. 12—'He was numbered with . . .'

In the October 6th issue of *The British Weekly* there is a brief account of Arthur Miller's powerful American novel, *Focus*.

'The tragedy of Lawrence Newman begins when, because he looks like a Jew, though he isn't, he is forced out of his good job. The anti-Semite feeling in New York prevents him from getting another, until a Jewish firm takes him on. Then the "Christian Front" invades his own road with a campaign to turn the Jewish residents out of it. They won't believe he is not a Jew. No one will believe it.

'He lives in terror. The more he tries to behave so as not to be mistaken for one, the more Jewishly furtive and apologetic his manner becomes. A Gentile, he suffers the persecution of the Jews. They beat him up. So, if they will have it that he is a Jew, he abandons the struggle.

'"How many of you people are there on that street?" asks the policeman when he seeks protection after the beating-up.

'"There are the Finkelsteins on the corner," he says.

'"Just them and yourself?"

'He wets his lips and takes the plunge. "Yes. Just them and myself," he says—

and (the book concludes) "felt as though he were setting down a weight which for some reason he had been carrying and carrying."'

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.